Blasting The Foundations

Of Atheism;

Its Pseudoscience and Pseudo-reason

Answering Richard Dawkins' (The God Delusion)

Volume I

Written by

AbulFeda'

Second Edition

Blasting The

Foundations

Of Atheism;

Its Pseudoscience and Pseudo-reason

Answering Richard Dawkins' (The God Delusion)

Volume I

Second Edition

Written by:

AbulFeda'

"Have you seen that which you plant and cultivate?

Is it you who grow it from seeds, or are We (plural of majesty) the Fosterer?

If We so willed, We verily could make it but wreckage, then would you cease not to exclaim:

Oh! we are laden with debt!

Oh! We are so deprived!"

(Translation of The Quran 56:64-67)

"I do not think an atheist can actually prove his own existence!"

"The art of making up fallacy, compiling it, believing it, and passing it on to next generations; is indeed the easiest of human crafts!"

"Death is not a failure! Decay, pain and disease are not a defect in ths system! It is obviously and indisputably perfect, and this negative component is obviously an essential part of the perfect way it is made to work! So why does there have to be negative? You can never answer that on your own! You need to know the exact purpose of its making, and that can only come from He who created!"

AbulFeda'

Introduction

بسم الله الرحمان الرحيم

الحمد لله وحده ..

والصلاة والسلام على من لا نبي بعده ..

أما بعد ..

All praise be to Allah, Lord of all that exists..

Lord of those who accept the truth, and those who do not! Lord of those who see it for what it really is, and those who see not! Keeper and sustainer of those who praise Him, and those who praise Him not!

It's been said that: *"Wisdom is the treasure of a Muslim; wherever it may be found, he's entitled to it"*

This is exactly what this book is about: Wisdom.

As a Muslim, I am not searching for wisdom; I believe that what I already have and am about to exhibit here: IS wisdom. This is why Elder sages of Islam, students of the disciples (Salaf) never condoned or approved of the Greek practice of philosophy when it came to issues that have already been answered soundly and consistently by the scripture of Islam. Most of the philosophers of Greece lacked knowledge of the deity; they knew none other than those pagan gods that were by nature, highly questionable to every sane self-respecting man at the time! So to obtain the ultimate truth; I do not have to be a philosopher! Only those who lack wisdom and sound consistent answers to the largest questions of life would stick to theories of philosophers!

I do not need to study philosophy or logic to be capable of thinking properly! I am not a philosopher or a logician, I never was and I never will call myself a philosopher! And the same goes to Richard Dawkins, author of (The God Delusion)! Perhaps he takes pride in studying some philosophy,

searching for the truth in that literature the way he does, I - on the other hand - do not! And I may easily tell him: “Sorry to disappoint you professor, but you’ve been searching in all the wrong places!”

Some people think that rational thinking has to be guided or governed by the theories of logicians and philosophers!

Well, it doesn’t! Rational thinking – as deep as it takes to examine a philosopher’s argument – is not a practice that only a philosopher can do! It was not discovered or devised by a logician! And although the majority of arguments that professor Dawkins puts forth in his book are arguments tackled in the western society basically by philosophers of science and theologians, he was never held back from offering his own views on them by the fact that he is a professor of zoology not of philosophy or theology! He is simply a man who specialized in a certain field of human knowledge that – I must say – was for the most part founded on a philosophical stance that drove him – out of his own personal experience with rationale - to the position he is now adopting towards what he calls faith and religion!

The problem now is that he thinks he is using science to make his case here, when indeed he is not, as I shall come to demonstrate! He is only applying fundamentally corrupt philosophical assumptions, supporting them with a radically false application of the scientific method! The rational issue of what “natural science” is, and what it is all about, is an issue that I addressed repeatedly on the course of this book, but let’s just say for now that agreeing on a proper definition of science; its purpose, its limits, the nature of its tools and the way it operates, will certainly help us put the subject matter of this book in its correct discipline of human knowledge, and choose the correct tool of human reason to approach it!

I should not go to the lab in search for answer to a question that CANNOT be answered by the tools and the means of “analytic chemistry” as a discipline of human knowledge, should I? A medical doctor is not in a place of authority to apply medicine for the sake of solving an economical problem, is he? But then again, all humans HAVE to contemplate in those

major questions and obtain their correct answers! Those questions about God, life, death, the purpose of life, and so forth!

Now, in order for them to do that (to simply think properly); do they have to confine themselves to the postulates and theories produced by other humanly limited minds like their own? This would only be unfair wouldn't it? Those are people who knew not, and who only had their shots and attempts by postulating what they only hoped would be the truth! Should you my reader be confined in any way to the means they took, or the arguments they held in so doing? Do you have to follow the lead of this or that philosopher or this or that theologian only to learn how to apply axiomatic reason? What if his choices were all wrong?

In fact this is exactly why disciplines of human knowledge would usually rejoice in the advent of a new theory that would bravely dig deep enough in the foundations of a previously adopted one, and prove the inconsistency inherent in its postulates! This is what made Einstein – for example - the champion of human knowledge that he is viewed to be! It takes bravery to question the foundations of a certain epistemic doctrine, a lot of bravery indeed; and it takes even more courage to put forth a totally different platform in its place!

It is amazing though, that as revered as those icons of human knowledge are in the eyes of atheists, they would still hold fast to the platform they have chosen for their process of reasoning as though it is the only humanly acceptable rationale for the question in hand! Einstein did what he did only because he dared to break loose from the platform of the Newtonian conception of the universe! He said to himself: "This is only a model of the universe proposed by a man like myself; I'm not forced by any authority to follow it as though it was unquestionable!" He was brave enough to challenge it – as foundational as it was to the field of theoretical physics in his time – and bring forth a different model!

Atheists never had any problem with that "revolution", did they?

So why not be at ease with someone who does something similar with the Darwinian conception of life? Well, they may easily praise a new Darwin

that may one day come to offer them a better theory (of philosophy actually not of science), only as long as it includes no deity or metaphysical agency whatsoever! Only as long as his theory is confined to the same platform of thought and reason they have chosen to stand upon and to call ‘science’, will it be granted approval in their eyes, and will it then rise to the magnitude of the advent of the theory of natural selection itself in their consideration! What a pity indeed! Should they for once succeed in taking off the dark, thick shades they put on their eyes, they would easily see that they are actually no different from any ministry of faith that defends and actually fights for its beliefs no matter how questionable they may be, except in the fact that those guys would call it theory of science, while priests would call it tenet or doctrine of faith!

The meaning of faith and the meaning of theory in addition to the question of what science is, are questions that I will have to address throughout this book to a certain depth – for necessity of the arguments I will establish - , as I answer to Dr. Dawkins’ arguments, not according to this or that philosopher; but according to a free mind that bears – because of its education in ultimate wisdom; the God-given knowledge of the truth - no submission whatsoever to any manmade hypothesis or postulate of any form! It will thus be only out of sheer coincidence that any of my arguments may come in resemblance to those of a particular philosopher or a theologian, and you can rest assured that I did not take him for reference or influence!

I follow strictly the teaching of this magnificent verse of the Quran, and the knowledge that follows it in the Wisdom of Sunnah:

((Say Bring forth your evidence if you were telling the truth)) Translation (2|111)

This is the basic axiom of reasoning that every Muslim who is well established in his faith, stands upon!

For the sake of comprehending the arguments I put in this work, my reader will not need any previous education in philosophy or philosophical Jargon. One only has to have a mind that is capable of running properly, and

examining every argument of reason in an ***evidently*** correct manner, free from all bias, pride and prejudice, to see the truth for what it is! As for theorization of philosophy on the subject matter; this is merely a mental asylum of wishful thinking to those who know not, on the hope that perhaps one day, one of them would eventually come up with a convenient answer that may fill this monumental gap!

Learning faith- along with its evident understanding – from its evidently divine source (scripture) is one thing, and postulating theory of philosophy is another! It's the difference between obtaining the answer from its only authoritative source; and – to put it simply - GUESSING it!

Although this notion regarding the approach to understanding scripture may appear to be irrelevant to the purpose of "science", it is actually far more relevant than many scientists may think, as will be explained in this literature!

A sharp line of distinction has to be drawn clearly between what people propose to be the truth, and what is evidently the truth; between theory and indisputable fact, between what people like to call evidence, even if it does not meet the first rational criteria of what may be called evidence at all, and what is indeed irrefutable evidence and proof; between what is truly a question of science, and what some may insist on calling "a question of science" even as it is obviously not within the tool of science or its end purpose to begin with! This line of distinction, I declare, comes from the only correct understanding of the only true scripture rightly ascribed to the only true creator of the universe, as I shall come to demonstrate within this book.

It is people like professor Dawkins that have to be addressed by this notion concerning the interpretation of scripture, to a certain level, as they attempt in many sections of their arguments against religion to raise the claim that dispute upon explanation of scriptures makes it easy for any holder of any false faith to find an easy way out of the charge, and claim that this is not the correct interpretation of those texts! This is a famous error of logic that he keeps making over and over throughout his argument against religion! The

fact that people differed in interpreting a certain text, does not disprove the authenticity of that text, neither does it render it obsolete! The fact that a certain volume of scripture has been proven inconsistent, does not prove that there is not a single statement of truth anywhere in its midst! The fact that a certain religion has been proven corrupt does not prove that all religions on Earth are nonsense, not to mention disprove the existence of God Himself! Those – my kind reader - are but a few examples of a barrage of scandalous logical errors and irrationalities underlying the arguments made by the professor throughout his book, as shall be elaborated in detail in this volume.

As I pointed out earlier, it is not science we are going to be discussing here for the most part; it is the underlying philosophy that constitutes the western secular understanding of what science itself is and what it is about, in the first place!

One of the signs any sane man should identify for the truth about the meaning of life – even before he examines it – when it is taken from any scripture, is that it should be by definition: Quite simple! You do not have to hold a PHD in philosophy to understand – as a human – what your creator is addressing to you! It is inherently unfair that only the most intelligent of men could understand it! If indeed the Lord creator is the source of this bulk of knowledge that you people – from any faith - ascribe to Him, then it must be comprehensible and easily accessible to every healthy human mind: and at that; you will never need to practice philosophy in attempt to explain it or understand it! Once you’re sufficiently educated in the language of scripture, you should only have to use the clearest, the simplest and the most profound axioms of human reason to understand it, the way those people who were originally addressed by it did! Otherwise, what wisdom would there be in a God that chooses to teach meaningless riddles or irrational claims to humanity?

Now, let me tell you what this book is not.

This book is not about the refutation of (The God Delusion). It certainly doesn’t take two volumes spanning over a thousand pages to refute (The God Delusion)! I chose (The God Delusion) in particular to achieve my

higher ends in this book, because to me it represents a conclusive example of all the damage that atheism and secularism have been doing to the world within the last century in particular, especially since Darwin turned this senseless belief into a philosophical doctrine of science! It gives a clear demonstration of how ultimately vacuous every atheist argument really is. It also portraits the dreams and ambitions of atheists, their views of morality and justice, what they are so desperately trying to create and propagate for the world to take in the place of religion, and their self-contradiction with regards to the way they think the world should be running with all those religions competing over the hearts and minds of men! Thus it appeared to me that it would be very convenient to destroy all the foundations of atheism and secular thought in our time, by means of tailoring a detailed response to the bestseller of a man who is currently considered to be the most effective and influential preacher of atheism in our times! It is – to my eyes - an ideal example to demonstrate to the world how inverse rationality and utter nonsense can be made into mainstream 'science', not only so, but even start to wage ideological warfare against human reason and clear commonsense, in the name of "raising people's consciousness", promoting science and defending proper reason against 'superstition'!

This book is not a literature of apologetics! Its object is clear from its title! There's too much fallacy taking radical dominion over modern thought and scientific academia in the Western world today that I decided it's about time somebody did something about it! Let the world see the depth of the fallacy, the magnitude of the loss and darkness, and the logarithmic descent on the curve of humanity, that mankind had gone through ever since they overthrew the leadership of the true wisdom of their creator! It's a pity that I had to respond to all sorts of uneducated and brainwashed bloggers, reporters and authors, who are enjoying the freedom to write and publish on religion even though they really do not know the first thing about Islam or about any religion for that matter, but that's the way it is in the world today, thanks to the circus of "freedom of nonsense"!

As I hope the reader will realize by the end of his long journey throughout this fat literature; it is not this large because I was having difficulty

explaining what I believe to be the right answer, no, but because I took my time in arguing forcefully and effectively against a great deal of fundamental fallacies that have become mainstream in our times, and I took great pleasure – I may add – in exposing in fair detail the irrationality and sheer emptiness of almost every fallacy that I came across as I read (The God Delusion)!

Thus I took liberty in quoting and commenting on so much of the professor's words, page by page, in a way I suppose my reader may have never seen in any western literature before, not because I needed to do so for the sake of proving that he stands upon nothing, but because I wanted to show the reader how empty, self-contradictory, inconsistent, anti-semiotic, anti-rational and even anti-scientific everybody who chooses to deny the undeniable will have to go in every claim that he makes in support of his position! This demonstration in itself was one of my goals for this book, and is one of the reasons why I chose (The God Delusion) in particular for my literary end. Sometimes I would find myself saying: "But my comment to this quotation will not add anything new to the main argument that I have already proven and demonstrated, so why bother make it?" but then I would find myself compelled to proceed with it for the sake of piling up further effective demonstrations of how fallacy only begets more fallacy. So as the reader approaches the conclusion of this book (Both of its volumes), he will have seen that it's not the building of the truth that took me so many pages; it's the demolition of the foundations of fallacy (along with many of its branches) that has become mainstream in a world of ideological chaos! He will see that he needs not be a biologist or a philosopher to accept the perfect and simple truth that has always been there before his eyes!

Here's an atheist biologist who believes that man needs a lot of "consciousness raising" to accept Darwinism and become a total liberalist! So let's see if it's really "consciousness raising" or "consciousness *RAZING*" that he's doing to his readers in the (The God Delusion)! Read through this literature and be the judge! So many are the ideas and theories that have been taken for granted within the last century that I know my reader will find the mere suggestion of challenging them or shaking them is

unthinkable! But I urge him to remember that some of the greatest breakthroughs in science itself were at one time “unthinkable”!

I appeal to your decency and self-respect my reader, to be brave! To have the courage to admit the truth as soon as it is revealed to you, no matter what people would think about you, no matter how many academics of your field may disregard you; the truth we are talking about here is no less than your own fate after death! This is a question of eternal fate; it is not the urge to consult a good doctor lest we get serious physical trouble for not doing so! It is a question of eternity!

You never know when you’ll die! Death could come to take you any minute! And once you’re there, there’s no coming back! It will be too late! Too late indeed! So you really have to take this question seriously, very seriously, and be brave!

In a very popular video clip on Youtube, when asked a very simple question by a student: “What if you’re wrong?” Professor Dawkins replies in clear scorn – not unexpectedly though – saying: *“Well, What if I’m wrong, I mean anybody could be wrong! We could all be wrong about the flying spaghetti monster and the pink unicorn and the flying tee-pot! ….”* And after a short lecture making the point that every child is naturally brought up on the faith of his parents, he winds up in an even more pompous comment saying: *“You ask me what if I’m wrong, What if you’re wrong about the great JuJu at the bottom of the sea?”*

At that, the audience breaks in laughter and he rejoices in his answer, pretending that it doesn’t concern him in the least that he could actually be wrong! While the question was plain and simple; the professor obviously hated to declare the clear and simple fact – a fact even to him - that if he is wrong, then he may - at least in what should be in his eyes a minute probability - meet with an unknown fate to him after his death; one that is determined by some of those many systems of faith he easily makes fun of, and could easily be that eternal inferno claimed by the three major religions: Islam, Judaism and Christianity!

He does recognize the likeliness of it, doesn't he? Shouldn't it make him – at least – a bit more humble in his reply towards the magnitude of knowledge in question and the possible consequences of the choice he is talking about? So why reply in such a scornful and arrogant manner?

Of course he knows it's a possibility! Very little probability (according to his philosophical position and understanding), but still a possibility nonetheless!

Well, he simply couldn't find it in him to make that brave and straightforward admission! Instead he strikes it right back in the face of his interrogator as though she insulted him with the question! He was defending his position by dropping his opponent down to his level saying, *"so what? You could be wrong too! You being born Christian means you have to suffer the same probability yourself as well, because your being born on a certain faith does not by any means prove that faith itself to be the truth!"* Well, you're right, it doesn't! So what if you're BOTH wrong? Suppose she asked the question this way: "What if we're both, you and I, Wrong?" Does this make the question more comfortable and more worthy of a straightforward and honest reply from you, professor?

One has no choice but to wonder then: as a scientist, is he not prepared to accept the natural 'probability' that he might be wrong on this question, and take the responsibility for his choice and the choices of those who followed his teaching? It is not a falsifiable theory of science then that he is preaching! It is another doctrine of blind faith, one that he obviously takes great pride in holding, no matter how hard he tries to look and sound as skeptic about evolutionism as any natural scientist should really be!

I hope my reader is not that biased, not that proud in dealing with such a dangerous issue! I hope he does realize that it is evidence he is looking for and that he should accept it no matter where it comes from, or who it is that holds it!

Initially, this book was planned to be published as a single volume of a thousand pages! However, I was advised to split it in two volumes, for ease of publishing and reading. Thus I chose to assign 'volume 1' to the

refutation of the core arguments in (*The God Delusion*) as presented by the professor in Chapters 3 and 4, hence making this Volume the core of the literature that may suffice for a reader who does not find ease in going through as much as a thousand pages! 'Volume 2' included the discussion of the rest of the (*The God Delusion*), and the fundamental refutation of some basic misconceptions about Islam that the professor – unsurprisingly – regurgitated in his book, especially in the last few chapters.

I now place this First Volume in my reader's hands, hoping that by the time the second volume was published, he will be more than willing to read it…

May the Lord guide every honest truth seeker to the truth, and take him into His limitless grace and mercy …

Amen.

Chapter One

Answering Chapter Three of the Delusion: Arguments for GOD's Existence

In this chapter, professor Dawkins approaches the arguments for the existence of the creator in a manner as though he is criticizing a theory of science! As though he is falsifying the postulates of a manmade theory! He probably imagines that there once came along a philosopher, long ago, somewhere in the world, who was contemplating in the beauty and magnificence of the universe, and after a long tiresome struggle with mathematics and philosophy; all of a sudden it struck him and he burst out saying: "Eureka! That's it! The universe must have had a Creator!"

As mentioned in the introduction, I have chosen to start this literature with response and thorough discussion of Chapters 3 and 4 of (The God Delusion) in particular because they represent the footing of the book, or the core argument so to speak! Once we got those two chapters out of the way, I'd then proceed with discussion of the rest of the book, putting forth the rest of what I wish to say.

Now let me begin by maintaining that the existence of a creator is not the advent of some human postulation or presumption that just appeared or came along at some point in history, the way Dawkins believes! It is – by necessity - the only reasonable outcome of axiomatic reason based on accumulative perception in every healthy mind! So, prophets or no prophets, doctrine or no doctrine, people never need – because of the very nature of human reason - to be told that a superior creator exists or to have somebody prove it for them! The concept of the creator was always conceived of as true and perfectly rational not through a single source of perception, but through ALL income of human perception; not in a single fragment of the universe; but in the entire universe! Such is – quite simply, and as I shall come to elaborate – the natural way the human mind works! Creation – and perfection at it to say the least - never needed to be "*proven*" in the same sense that any theory demands proof, not because people are being brought up on it, taking it for granted among other things as 'blind faith' without ever daring to question it, but because it is simply not possible that any reasonable man could look at this marvelous universe and find himself compelled to think otherwise! It is indeed a meaning too clear and reasonable to be questioned or to demand any particular proof for it! It is not a theory or a philosophy! It's basic axiomatic reason! A marvelous system that is perfectly composed, restricted, balanced and controlled necessitates an ultimately perfect composer, restrictor, balancer, and controller! This is not a statement that people make from blind faith in any given religion, it is an argument that is as axiomatic and self-evident – in terms of language and reason – as the argument – for example - that since I can think then I must have a mind!

Let me express it mathematically: Since system A is a set that is composed of elements {a,b,c,d,e,f} and since system A is decomposable by nature and its elements – in principle - can be made to compose system A once again, or any other system, **therefore system A was composed**. And since "to be composed" necessitates that there be a willful composer that causes composition of elements to be initiated, and a system to be made up, then there must be a composer for A. The same goes for any given system B, C, D, and so forth. Now, if set U is the universal set of ALL systems that have smaller components (U = set A U B U C U D …etc: the set of all systems that we see around us that are compose and decomposed), where all those systems interact, some of which decompose in due time, leaving elements that would then be made parts of new systems that come to take their place in perfect integration within this coherently stable and perfectly consistent system U, then U necessitates a superior composer and keeper, who made all those components and composed U, and then kept it running in this particular way (the way of systems and subsystems interacting, composing and decomposing).

In short: Everything around us is *composed* = therefore it has a *composer*! Because composing is a deed that demands a doer! It's not just the effect of a cause, it is a complex work of organized causes that demands a willful, purposeful and determined doer; a composer. We are talking about the establishment of the very meaning of the verb (to compose), which is what begets the meaning: (composed)!

Now this meaning, my reader, is rationally indisputable! This is basic reason! It is not a theory! If we did not see it as a rational necessity, then we should never trust our minds anymore! My previous statement of it is only my mathematical attempt to express a meaning that is as axiomatic to human reason as this statement: (1 + 1 + 1 = 3)! Without the willful composer and keeper there would be no order, and no natural law to keep systems and components bound to this particular path; it would be just like saying (1 + 1 + 1 = 0)! This meaning was never proposed or theorized! It emerges naturally from our observation of everything in the world around us; everything we can observe is made of components that are "put together", so

there must be an initial "putter"; thus the entire universe (the sum of everything that is composed of components) necessitates a superior composer! A composer that is by necessity not composed Himself, otherwise he would be just like us: only another element of the set U (the sum of all systems that are composed of subsystems and components)!

I ask every reasonable reader now: Does this rationale demand "proof"? Do we need to prove that since something consists of perfectly functional elements, then they must be put together in this particular way by a superior maker for a particular purpose? It's quite obvious that we don't! This is the way the mind works; it cannot think of this universe as anything but a perfectly *created* and masterfully *composed* and *preserved* universe! Natural law in itself is proof for this! Even atheists cannot resist this meaning, and they find themselves compelled whenever they describe the universe and elements of natural life, to use a language that - despite their hardest efforts as we shall see - continues to betray their ultimately irrational belief! As we will elaborate later in this literature, they cannot escape using words like (selected: which necessitates a selector), (designed: which necessitates a designer) and so on.

This is why I don't know whether to laugh or cry when I listen to atheists saying that the burden of proof is upon the rest of humanity to "prove" creation! This is nonsense! It is exclusively upon atheists, to prove that such a - very clearly - magnificent universe, such a perfectly **conserved** and **controlled** system, is – and against what all humans hold by necessity of reason – NOT the outcome of the work – both the initial and ongoing work - of what is clearly a masterfully wise and purposeful maker-sustainer, but the outcome of the contrary to that! There's no proving this nonsense of a meaning no matter how hard they try! Their very tongues cannot allow them! When the meaning is so audaciously FALSE, no mathematical argument, observation or scientific discovery could ever qualify as evidence or proof for it! We cannot prove that all humans are deluded to take creation for an axiomatic rational necessity, because then it will mean that they could easily be deluded – just the same - on all other rational axioms that they take for granted; meanings without which reason itself cannot work! If I cannot

trust that I exist (for example), and I need to search for proof of this very meaning; then I am indeed a sick man that is in a desperate need for help! How can a man trust his own senses and his own judgment when he forces himself to believe that his senses delude him, and that they fool him into seeing purposeful creation where there is actually none? And if the very meaning of the word (true) or (real) is open to questioning, then what could any (search for the truth) ever lead to, and what then would be the very function of reason itself? There's no point arguing with such a mindset!

Atheism is indeed a mental sickness as I shall come to prove by tens of different arguments in this literature! So I ask of my reader to be patient and read this large volume all the way through to the end.

Dawkins is trying in this chapter – against everything that humans hold dear in their heads and in their hearts - to prove that we *'no longer'* have any reason to take creation for granted! He is out to tell the world that we now finally have a theory, or a body of theorization that leaves no room for that creator! And since he deliberately denies this rational necessity to which all healthy humans are bound, he embarks on a futile attempt to disprove the existence of God by examining the writings of a few theologians or philosophers from here or there, as though this is everything that theists rely upon to hold their fundamental rationale of the creator!

Atheists have got to understand that unlike atheism, "theism" was never "theorized"! There never came along a monk or a figure of authority in a human nation who proposed this concept and called upon others to follow him on it! It is, as I shall elaborate in this section, a necessity of reason, and a deep call of innate bright-right from deep within every human being! Prophets only teach us who God is and what purpose He has assigned to us, but nobody teaches us that there has to be a creator who made us the way we are, and made the world around us the way it is! We see it with our own eyes ever since we start making sense of the world!

Heading this chapter professor Dawkins states:

“Arguments for the existence of God have been codified for centuries by theologians, and supplemented by others, including purveyors of misconceived 'common sense'.”

Now I have to wonder, what does he make of this “codification” and how does he really think of it? Is it to him; the “innovation” of the concept itself, as was the case with every philosophy or theory put forth by an individual human mind? If this is what he means by applying the term “codification” here, regarding the existence of a creator, then I should say that he is making in advance a proposition that cannot be accepted, much less built upon, without being in itself *proven*!

I may be asking him now to prove to us that there once was a time in history when humans never imagined this marvelous world to have a creator, and the thought never even crossed their minds, until all of a sudden an individual mind started “codifying” this “claim” and hence calling unto them to follow it! It is clear to me that this is the underlying **belief** that Dawkins holds concerning what he calls the arguments for the existence of God! This will be revealed in detail later on when he discusses the origins of religion, and we shall attend to it in ‘Volume 2’. The point is; this is nothing but a statement of blind Darwinian faith from his part.

And of course when professor Dawkins speaks of a “misconceived common sense” one has no choice but to wonder, what “kind” of a common sense is he speaking of, and according to what authority of reason does he give himself the right to accuse a figure that may go somewhere around 99.99 percent of all humans that ever set foot on this earth of misconception in the way they accepted their common sense in regards to this basically reasonable question?

So it turns out that I – along with the rest of humanity - am a misconceived fool to let myself think that I and everything around me was created masterfully, now that someone has finally succeeded – according to Dawkins – in forging a “magnificent” explanation to “the origins of life” that just might be good enough to be a replace “God” and save me from

following this natural reasoning and this common meaning that all humans find within themselves as soon as they start making sense of things!

I am supposed to let go of pure reason and very clear common sense regarding the origins of everything that I see around me, for the sake of a clearly un-provable and – as we will demonstrate later on – clearly flawed theory on the origin of species! Those are the grounds of reasoning upon which he accuses the human race – save for atheists like himself – of suffering from misconception of their very own common sense!

Oh what a miserable race we are indeed!

Now make no mistake my reader; I'm not taking support for my argument in the multitude of its holders across human history, no! My position of knowledge is entirely against this kind of reasoning, as I will be demonstrating throughout this literature! The truth remains to be the truth, and a fallacy remains to be a fallacy, no matter how many people believe it! I'm simply expressing my astonishment at how a man can so easily accuse almost all humanity all along its history of "misconceiving" its "common sense"! What meaning would remain in the word "commonsense" itself (as opposed to nonsense) if all humans have been misconceiving it? Or in clearer words, are you trying, Dr. Dawkins, to shout in the face of all humanity saying: "You people have all been fooled by your commonsense and the very tool in your minds and in your cognition that made you the elite species that you obviously are"?

What an outrage!

Thomas Aquinas …

In a debate with Michael Shermer held in August 2008 in Sydney, Dr. John Lennox declared his amazement in the fact that Dawkins did not call his book: "The (Created God) delusion"! I can only salute him for this witty comment! Because simply, no theist believes in a "created god"! The concept of infinite regress – as shall be elaborated later on – is by no means an argument to hold against the rationale of the creator!

(http://www.google.com/search?q=shermer+versus+john+lennox&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&client=firefox-a)

In this section of the chapter, we can see how Dawkins goes to extremes in applying philosophical tricks for the sake of putting off the argument of god! Those tricks are not without a simple and reasonable answer as we shall see! Those are not unsolvable problems of reason as he presumes them to be! They are simply the outcome of a corrupt philosophy, nothing more nothing less!

Dawkins starts examining the arguments of Thomas Aquinas for the existence of god, and I quote:

> *"The five 'proofs' asserted by Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century don't prove anything, and are easily - though I hesitate to say so, given his eminence - exposed as vacuous. The first three are just different ways of saying the same thing, and they can be considered together. All involve an infinite regress - the answer to a question raises a prior question, and so on ad infinitum." (The God Delusion p.77)*

Now the professor thinks that by refuting Aquinas' arguments, he will "disprove" the existence of God! Okay then … let's see those arguments and his answers to them!

> *"The Unmoved Mover. Nothing moves without a prior mover. This leads us to a regress, from which the only escape is God. Something had to make the first move, and that something we call God. …"*

Well, to build his objection on describing the answer of "god" here as an "escape"; this is clearly no argument, and it reflects the sheer poverty of reason upon which all atheists build their position as we shall demonstrate!

Why call it an escape? Because he doesn't like it? Because it's too simple an answer? Because it can't be tested in a lab? Why? Since when was the clearest and most obvious of all answers to such a question (supposing there are any other answers at all to begin with!): "An escape"? Escape from what and to where? If you have managed to come up with another answer, professor, then by all means put it forth and prove its rationality! But DO

NOT describe the only reasonable answer any man can think of to such a fundamental question as an “escape”! At least, at the very least, give the rest of mankind (besides atheists) the credit of believing in something that is good enough to be a possible ‘explanation’! Since you’re so fond of fallaciously putting “statistical probability” into every “gap”, professor, tell me then, what are the odds that 85 % or more of humans alive today (and a much bigger percentage of humans indeed all along the history of mankind!) have all been delusional on the creator, and are only just “*escaping*” the “problem”?

You say this is “infinite regress” and then call the notion of God an escape from it! But whoever said it’s “INFINITE” or endless to begin with? And at that, let us ask you: what is the meaning of this infinity that you – a limited being clearly limited by the system that confines you – are speaking of here? Simple reason shows that it has to have an ending, as it is the natural property of everything that we see in this universe!

The basic components of the universe are clearly finite! Every system that we can now observe is built of smaller components, built from the decomposition of previous systems! So no matter how far up and down the levels of complexity would go, it has to come to a limit! Otherwise the very concept of equilibrium and balance would be obsolete! Actions would not yield equal and opposite reactions; they wouldn’t yield a reaction at all! Positive polarities would not demand equal negative polarities! The system, no matter how huge it really is, has to be limited and enclosed!

All those motions, all those reactions, all those intertwined causes we rejoice in contemplating and discovering (and we can only see the tiny tip of the iceberg) must all be enclosed in one huge envelope that is controlled and sustained by an external agent; the creator! So when you say “infinite regress” implying that the levels of causes in the system are endless in their count, you are actually breaching the system itself, and proposing a model that destroys the rational necessity of its enclosure and consistency!

Even the mathematical infinity itself is an expression of the rational necessity of this limit at the top of all material causes, beyond which comes the external creator!

'Infinity' is treated in mathematics as a quantity in itself! We found we had no choice but to deal with it as such. An exceptional type of quantity (number, or value) of course, but a quantity nonetheless! There's no escaping this! It's like we know there has to be a final value at the far end, but we just cannot afford to determine it, trace it down or even imagine it, thus in our limitedness we call it "infinity"; the numerical inverse of the zero! **It's an expression of recognizing the existence and general qualities of X coupled with admitting the incomprehensible nature (quantity) of X!** Please reread this previous sentence carefully because it is important.

This incomprehension comes from the fact that though we know – recognize - that this value has to exist at the end of the line, we understand that whatever comes after it, is simply uncountable, and does not fall within the field of what "counting" itself is about! It is wrong to suppose that there's nothingness beyond it! Something odd happens there that breaks the trend and terminates the line; but it's not the turn into nothingness! Simple reason denies this meaning, and necessitates the existence of something there that is totally different in its quality and the way it works than anything that could be counted by human numbers!

This is why this quantity (infinity) is the only quantity where it is true to say (X+n = X) where "n" is any real value other than zero, and X substitutes for infinity! At that point, there is no meaning for any further addition or multiplication or any mathematical operation whatsoever! It is a point beyond the capacity of mathematics itself as a tool! The scale or the number-line simply ends there! The purpose of mathematics and human analogy stops there! And though it is obviously a rational necessity that something does exist beyond that point; it is also clear that whatever it is, it cannot be quantified or analogized to anything within this system!

This phenomenon of mathematics (numerical infinity) has only one rational explanation: It describes that point in the universe where all that is reasonably quantifiable by the human mind ends! Is this mathematical quantity thus – by definition – a connotation of "endlessness"? No! It is clearly the last recognizable point – though obviously unreachable to human reason - on the scale of all that can be counted, analogized and quantified WITHIN THIS SYSTEM! And the very fact that we do recognize this point the way we do, and deal with it the way we do, proves that this regress of causes, levels of causes, or layers of complexity, or whatever scale you wish to apply it to, does indeed come to a final point where this mode of reasoning itself has no choice but to recognize that something fundamentally different in nature or attributes comes in place beyond it! Something that is truly limitless, countless, and cannot be analogized or quantified by any means that could be afforded by man! In other words; mathematics in its very nature cannot go there!

I urge my reader to contemplate deeply on this insight!

Mathematical Infinity obviously does not mean that this model, this countable model of the universe that we observe and deal with by our tools of reason, keeps going on to no end! It does not mean that the scale is open ended (which is the common – and basically linguistic - understanding of the term infinite), it actually means that it does indeed have an ending; one that cannot be determined by any tool of reason that we humans possess! The point of arithmetic infinity is simply the point where our minds fail and we can no longer count!

It may be worthwhile to add that astronomers managed to calculate the size of the observable universe. This size they calculated – roughly 30 billion light years - is not all that the universe is! It's only how far they can currently see! In fact, the universe as a whole; has to be as wide as this "infinity" value that we ponder about! The edge of the universe, beyond which exists the creator Himself, has to be at that point that is recognized by mathematical reason as the last point where numbers have any capacity to count or to mean anything at all! That is, no matter how huge the biggest value you can think of is, the universe is much wider; and this goes on not

forever, but until the actual value of "infinity" – unachievable by man - is reached!

And since we cannot reason this value or even imagine it, it must follow that no matter how far we may ever manage to go or to measure in the universe, there will always be much further away to go, and much more to measure and count! We – the limited humans - will never come even remotely close to that place on our own! The very concept of mathematical infinity proves this meaning, because if we could reach that point, then it's not "infinity", and we can still count further and go further beyond it! This is how the universe is built, and how our minds are formatted to make sense of it! Our very tool of reason screams in our faces that it is indeed **limited**, and that it must be that beyond this unreachable limit is the almighty Himself, in perfect accordance with what reason necessitates His attributes to be, and what He – indeed - teaches about Himself!

Thus I hold that reason, physics, astronomy, and mathematics necessitate that there be an end point at the top of the scale, any scale within this system, at which the regress ends, and where the tip of the chain is held by its keeper, sustainer! And even though it may be recognized as "infinity" to our human mathematical capacity, it is by necessity of reason the end point! It proves – in its abstract meaning – that our capacity to do science and philosophy was not made to help us understand anything about the ways and the nature of what is there beyond: The uncreated creator of this limited system! Infinity in this sense is not the indication of endlessness of the universe itself, but of the human inherent inability to determine or even imagine the value defining the end of the system! I emphasize this meaning and I say that if this is your conception of mathematical infinity, then yes, the regress of causes is *mathematically* infinite, and at its very end, beyond the point of infinity (∞); comes the creator! And if – on the other hand – you define infinity as endlessness (linguistically, not as the mathematical quantity) then I say 'infinite regress' is false and in this case I would argue that the regress is FINITE, not infinite! Either ways, it has to end at the uncreated creator, by necessity of reason.

In a further insight, I would like to point out that this meaning supports the attributes of the creator's almighty self that He teaches in Islam. He has to be – by necessity of reason - the sole holder of total control, with no partner, and no chance whatsoever for any creature to compete with Him or to rebel against Him or to share power with Him; otherwise the system will be liable to crash! The Quran coins this argument clearly in this verse: ***((Had there been therein (i.e., in the heavens and the earth) gods besides Allâh, then verily both would have been ruined.))*** (Translation of meanings 21:22)

It is essential for the sake of the system itself, that no element within it should ever have the capacity to breach it on its own will and power, or escape from His total dominion! This is why man has to be limited in such a clearly demonstrable way, even as he attempts to imagine how big the universe itself really is! He was not made to be a god, or to share dominion upon the universe with its creator! In this respect one can see that even when you call it "infinite" regress, it does not refute the existence of the creator; it actually proves it mathematically! It is the only explanation that comes in perfect accord with the way the human mind works.

> *"2 The Uncaused Cause. Nothing is caused by itself. Every effect has a prior cause, and again we are pushed back into regress. This has to be terminated by a first cause, which we call God. …"*

Yes indeed … so what's the problem with that, professor?

> *"3 The Cosmological Argument. There must have been a time*
>
> *when no physical things existed. But, since physical things exist*
>
> *now, there must have been something non-physical to bring*
>
> *them into existence, and that something we call God."*

I feel compelled to comment on the argument itself and its choice of words here. If by physical the author of this argument means "material", that is; a subordinate element within this system, then yes indeed, the creator of the universe is non-physical! But if he means by physical; the contrary to verbal or metaphoric, then of course the creator is in this sense, physical; that is He is *real*! As for the meaning of the argument; it simply goes down to the very

simple meaning: "Since this universe exists the way it does, it must have had a creator that differs from it in His properties." And this is obviously a rational necessity; the very same necessity we are trying to push back into the minds of atheists! [1]

---

[1] It may be true that none of the commonly known versions of the Cosmological argument is sufficient on

Here's a rather long version of the cosmological argument, one that may seem to be inspired by "Set theory".. You may call it "the systemic cosmological argument" if you wish. I made it up just now only to make my point here!

Premise one: Every system that is composed of smaller components (the terms particles, parts, or elements may be used here), must begin to exist by means of a definitive cause that is external to it, which brought its components together.

Premise two: Composed systems interact systematically (emerging and decaying) as subsystems of an even bigger system in the universe.

Premise three: The universe is - by definition - the sum of all composed systems, subsystems and particles that we know exist (The mother system of which all conceivable systems are subsystems).

Premise four: The cause of all systems and components cannot be a system comprised of components himself, or else he will fall within the set of all composed systems!

Therefore it follows that the universe had a beginning and is - by necessity - caused by an external composer that is not "composed" or caused, has no beginning, and is not bound by any of the rules that bind this system or any of its components.

Premise one, to my eyes, is both an irrefutable A-Priori statement (it follows from the very meaning of the passive verb "composed") and is supported by all conceivable observations and human experience of the way matter (both animate and inanimate) works. Premise two and three are equally plausible, since all particles in this universe are in an ongoing process of composition and decay, in the form of systems and subsystems at numerous levels, the highest level of which is the envelope of all particles and systems that we call the universe! The view of the universe as a consistent collective system of all systems was never in need for verification, least of all today with all the knowledge we have gathered in the last two centuries about the way it works and the way its constants are all tuned, and its elements are all organized in perfect equilibrium. No one can claim that it is wrong to call the universe a closed system!

Now this version of the argument is far more powerful than other commonly known versions because it does not leave room for an objection by the claim that - for example - the universe cannot be proven to have had a beginning, or the ridiculous claim that the word "everything" in the common wording of the temporal cosmological argument is contradicted by the impossibility that time (in its abstract meaning) may have had a previous cause to it, viewing it as a "thing"!

It may be worth noting that someone may argue that the first premise here does not include the smallest particle that cannot be divided into smaller components! My response would simply be that no such particle was ever proven to exist, and it's not a rational necessity! Prove to us that there is indeed such a particle in nature, and then we will debate! But you can't do that, can you?!

In fact, not only is it not a rational necessity; it cannot be justified by any rational process of analogy we humans can propose! If this particle is indivisible because it is too small to be divided; then it's not a particle at all, and it cannot be part of a bigger particle! It is true that a point – in Cartesian geometry – has (zero) length, but it is only true because a point is not meant to express a physical quantity! A point is only the abstraction of a particular place in space, a locus! There is no such a thing in real life as a (Zero) diameter circle (i.e. point)! Whenever you plot a point on some piece of paper, it will always have a

Now watch how Dawkins comments on those three arguments; I quote:

> *"All three of these arguments rely upon the idea of a regress and invoke God to terminate it. They make the entirely unwarranted assumption that God himself is immune to the regress. Even if we allow the dubious luxury of arbitrarily conjuring up a terminator to an infinite regress and giving it a name, simply because we need one, there is absolutely no reason to endow that terminator with any of the*

---

diameter; otherwise it will not be there at all! No matter how tiny an entity may be in reality, the way we see nature works, demands that it be divisible into yet tinier and smaller parts. Reason does not allow us to claim that at some point at the bottom of this system, there is a particle X that can only be divided into particles that are dimensionless (which means: it cannot be divided)! Something that has no width; is not to be called a physical particle, the accumulation of which should give us a particle that has a width! It's simply (nothing)! It's like saying (0+0=1) or (0 x 2 = 1); it's a false meaning! So not only can you not prove that such an indivisible entity exists; fact of the matter is it is not a rational necessity, not even a reasonable possibility!

We simply say that this regress cannot keep on going down to a (zero) particle, because if zero means nothing (which is indeed what is means), then we obviously cannot reduce the smallest "thing" to "nothing"! So there can be no such thing as a smallest indivisible particle, which is rendered indivisible because if it were divided, its parts would be (zero) in mass or volume! Every fraction (real number) could indeed be (fractioned) – in theory - to yet a smaller Real number, which goes down to an end that just cannot be conceived by man (A kind of infinity that is identified by mathematics as *tending* to zero: not an actual zero, but can only be treated as such). The smallest "fraction" in mathematics is not Zero, but it is too small a value for human reason – not to mention human senses – to deal with, or to distinguish from a Zero. So we can see that mathematics – in its blunt axiomatic referential – expresses the limitedness of our human tools of knowledge in this respect (in micro-scale) just as it does at the other end of the spectrum (macro-scale). We simply need to acknowledge this, and force our limited minds to just stop there! Reaching out beyond the imaginable is so tempting indeed; but unfortunately, it drives a man out of his mind!

Now I feel I should draw my reader's attention to the fact that even though I just crafted and furnished a rigid philosophical argument for the existence of God, and even furnished responses to possible objections to it; this is NOT by any means the way I know that God exists, and this is not the method I use to argue in His favor! His existence is by all means rationally axiomatic and is evident from all that comes to me from my senses, and from all that my mind makes out of that input! Thus we say that any argument of philosophy that seeks to present itself as evidence for His existence would be reductive no matter how masterfully it is crafted! This is why followers of prophets never asked them to "prove" the existence of God to them, but rather to prove their claims of prophethood! It has always been a rational and linguistic fact that demands no proof! Now the fact that certain miserable people started to question this fundamental notion does not leave me in need to forge such arguments of philosophy to prove to them that bright is the day and dark is the night! It only leaves them in need for a mental cure to sweep away those layers of false philosophy that have inverted their natural human reason and spoilt their commonsense! This is exactly why this literature turned out to be a huge two-volume book! I'm not arguing for the truth, I'm rather destroying huge towers of false argumentation and philosophy that have captivated western thought within the last few centuries! I will discuss in detail my position to the issue of arguing "for the existence of God" in volume 2. Just let it be clear for now that no matter what atheists may do in refutation of this "argument" I just forged; I couldn't possibly care less! I never said it is a text of scripture or God-given revelation anyway! So I tell them now: save your efforts and don't bother! Just read this book (both its volumes) all the way to the end, and see if you could break free from your biases and prejudices, and specifically from your deep despise and hate for Islam in particular, because if you could do that (may Allah give you the strength), then I guarantee to you that by the end of this long journey throughout these two large volumes, you will come out a different man!

> *properties normally ascribed to God: omnipotence, omniscience, goodness, creativity of design, to say nothing of such human attributes as listening to prayers, forgiving sins and reading* innermost thoughts. … " (Dawkins p. 78)

This reply clearly demonstrates the *delusion* the author suffers from in approaching the question of God. As we keep repeating over and over again: we DO NOT speak of a CREATED God! He has to understand that regress is only a property of the *system* and its *created elements* within it, just like programs running on a computer system; they may regress in amongst their inter-processes for as many levels as the system contains, but they will never include the human programmer himself anywhere within that particular chain of regress; it will only have him seated at the end of it, at the keyboard of the computer machine, where he runs the system from **outside**! The creator of the system is by necessity EXTERNAL to it, and is not liable to any of the processes that He created within the system, level above level, and cause above cause! Yes there will be regress, and yes every cause will have a causer affecting it in the system, but for any given system or set of systems, this will have to come to a point where the regress ends (the system *closes*) at the last cause within the system, and the chain terminates before a creator who is – by necessity - external to the system he created!

So claiming Him to be part of the regress is simply to turn Him into a subject of creation; just like all other elements of the chain of regress within the system that He created! This is clearly false! Its fallacy comes from the fact that He must be the one who created ALL "creatable systems"! If He himself was creatable, then he is yet another "creatable system", another ring in the chain that will have to end at the 'uncreated creator'! The chain has to come to an end, otherwise the very meaning of causality and "system" will fail! Hence the rational necessity of "the first cause"! We are speaking of the creator of all created things in existence, the one who gives the act of creation itself its meaning and purpose, and the word cause itself its initial definition! You cannot demand of the laws of created things to apply to the creator of all created things! He created the chain of regress; he's not part of it!

The point it; you have no choice – rationally - but to acknowledge the existence of an uncreated creator; an uncaused case! Commonsense leads to it, reason necessitates it, language presupposes it, and mathematics demonstrates it!

Some philosophers would easily object to the argument of the first cause saying that there's no reason to believe that there's a first cause, stemming from the famous question: (If God created me then who created God?)… They would argue that philosophers have been questioning the very meaning of "cause" itself, and the determinism of causality. Well, philosophers have gone as far as questioning the very meaning of reality itself, to the extent of actually making a man doubt that he himself exists to begin with! Does this make such arguments reasonable or at any level: worthwhile? [2]

I mean suppose a philosopher came to you one day with a book, a large volume, and told you that once you have gone through this book, you will come out doubting your very own senses and your perception as a human being; would you really bother reading it? Perhaps you would be tempted by the challenge of the idea itself and that's why you may go through it; a mental exercise of some twisted sort perhaps! I can think of no other motive for any sane man to go through something like that, other than of course

---

[2] One of the silliest arguments I ever came across against the position that the universe must've been caused to exist, is the argument that causality itself did not exist or did not make sense before the origination of space-time! I ask, what is space-time? Space-time is only a mathematical means of relating two events to one another on a frame of reference for both space and time! There is no rationality in claiming that time did not "exist" before the advent of the universe as we know it, because time is only a measure of the progress of events! Yes of course our own model of it and the way we perceive it and calculate it did not exist before the advent of the universe, it did not exist before the advent of man himself, but this has nothing to do with the rational necessity of causality at every conceivable instant of time, be it within our human frame of reference of space-time that we came to establish after the advent of the universe, or before that! An argument as such – I believe – would only emerge from the mind of a scientist who doesn't quite comprehend the distinction between the rational necessity of a certain abstract meaning, and the human ways of applying this meaning to their own frame of existence! Yes before the universe came to be there was something else, something we have no way of knowing or imagining (we can only be told about it by its creator, if we were ever to know it at all), but we certainly have no rational argument in claiming that causality did not apply there! We cannot conceive an existence without causality in the first place! And we know it is impossible because by making this claim, we would be making a proposition of an existence that couldn't possibly allow for any system or any order or anything at all to emerge! We would be wondering: How was it ever possible that the very concept of 'natural law' would emerge in such an a-causal existence? So denying causality before the advent of the universe is utterly irrational, because it destroys the very rationality of the universe itself ever coming into being (the event of its emergence) in the first place! It destroys the very meaning of an 'event', so to speak!

So in short: while the rational argument goes this way: without causality, there couldn't have ever emerged any matter or anything at all that we may conceive by measures of space or time, some atheists would put it in the exact inverse order saying: without (or before) 'time' there couldn't be any causality!

debunking it and proving its sheer corruption! But if we, humans, have come to a point where we need to prove the very basics of our reason and cognition, or to prove that we actually exist in the first place; then we really no longer deserve to call ourselves rational beings!

A mind that is so disturbed as to doubt its own senses is one that needs cure, not recognition as an intellect of philosophy that is worth listening to and arguing with! Yet, those poor guys are philosophers whose works do cover library shelves everywhere and are viewed with respect and veneration by millions of people! It's a pity indeed!

Not everything that was ever questioned is indeed *questionable*! The mere fact that philosophers questioned this and questioned that doesn't render a given fact of human reason and perception: **questionable**! It rather renders those philosophers – most of the time - mentally challenged!

If you have something against causality that is expressible in the form of a rational argument, then bring it forth and we will examine it! But to carry the sum of all futile claims and debates of philosophers questioning everything, and come up with the conclusion that this "sum" leaves those facts lacking for rational evidence; this is just like dumping yourself in a big trash can and complaining about the offensive smell that is everywhere around you, concluding that there is no evidence for the existence of clean air itself! Just get your head out of there and you will smell fresh air; that much I guarantee!

So again, this is simple reason and language at work here! The creator of all that is created COULDN'T be Himself created! Otherwise, he would not be the creator of everything, but would only be another part of the chain which will still have to end at a first creator that is not just another part of it! We do not claim the creator to be part of the chain of causes; atheists ought to understand this meaning! We reason Him to be the source; the maker of that chain itself, from its very top all the way down to its very bottom, with all levels of causes layered in between! We humans find it only reasonable to think of Him as an external being to everything that is caused and created!

If the meaning of "being created" is to be applied to X, along with those things that X created, then it follows that X is not the rationally necessary end source beyond that chain of created creators, and we will still have to think of yet another external source from whence the very meaning of cause and creation itself emerged, and from nowhere else! And then again, wherever that external source beyond X will be, it can only be GOD! There

at the point where nothing further can be counted! Keep wiggling around it for as long as you wish; you will never find a way out of it! It's just the way the human mind works!

Now, imagine a man who would ask: "Did the creator create the uncreated (or the un-creatable)?" This is nonsense! It's like asking: "Have you ever gone beyond existence?" Or "Are you not what you are?" Or "Can you give me something that does not exist?" Or: "Can you be you and me both at the same time?" Or: "Can a single being be both here and there at the same time?" The answer to all such nonsense is not just a simple "NO!" Those people have to be dragged back to common sense and correct reason, if they wish for our debate with them to take us anywhere!

It wouldn't be "un-creatable" if the creator could create it, would it?! It would be "creatable"! To go beyond existence is to not exist, so nobody can go there, or do you think otherwise?! Can anybody (who does exist); "not exist"? This is the problem with claiming that the chain doesn't have to end this way!

The uncreated creator or the uncaused cause is an inevitability of reason! It's only a pity there are those who would really acquire "proof" for its rational validity!

Another misconception is tailored in this commentary by the author as he claims that even if we admitted the rational necessity of a terminal source at the end of the chain, there is no reason to believe him to have those attributes that he mentions! I have to comment on Dawkins' proclaimed certainty here as he states in amazing confidence: "*there is **absolutely** no reason to endow that terminator with any of the properties normally ascribed to God"*! I take it that Professor Dawkins may come to accept the concept of god one day but only provided that we accept the possibility of His being a pathetic, incomplete being that does not enjoy any attributes of perfectness as such! Yes indeed! He may only be comfortable – as we shall come to see clearly throughout this book - with a poor negligent god that does not control a man's life or demand his submission!

This is by the way a questionable shift by the author from the argument at hand! Nothing but 'white noise'! You still have not answered to the regress problem professor, and have not founded your objection on sound reasons! So to jump – in this context - to the examination of certain attributes ascribed to the creator by certain religions, on the claim that ***even if there was a creator*** then there's no reason to view him to be so and so … this is a

clear escape from the groundless refutation of the previous argument! It's a statement of stubborn denial! It's like saying: *"Ok, maybe I can't really determine why your argument is false; but even if it were true, you people are talking nonsense anyway!"*

Is this all you've got, professor?

One can't help sensing the FEAR in this man's heart as he writes down those literary "escapades" of his! Yes; FEAR! He is obviously doing everything he possibly can to mutilate the image of the creator that is described as such in the three religions (Islam, Judaism and Christianity) in particular, probably out of fear that he may one day find himself compelled – by force of rational evidence - to choose to submit to Him! It's as though he's saying: *"Even if I one day accepted the argument of a god eventually, I will not accept that god to be so powerful, so knowledgeable, and so "judgmental"! I refuse to surrender myself to any celestial being in such a way!"*

This is obviously where this "*absolutely*" gesture is coming from here!

In fact as we will see in coming sections of his book, Dawkins almost declares that he may be okay with a deist god like the one that Einstein spoke of in the few occasions that he expressed his views of God, but a "*personal*"[3] God who "reads your thoughts", listens to your prayers, commands you to submit to Him, and eventually judges you in the afterlife? No way! We will see by the end of this literature that all that atheism goes down to is a personal attitude of rejection against the particular idea of **submission**, not a rational objection against the existence of the creator! This is why Islam – in particular - always comes at the very top of their list of enemies, and always takes the greatest share of their hate and contempt! Because Muslims – by the very name of their religion - do take the meaning of submission seriously! Only those Muslims who are "lax" in this respect and are willing to take some of the religion and leave the rest of it out, are

[3] The idea of claiming an impersonal god is every bit as irrational and vacuous as believing in no god at all. In fact, it is only an atheist's attempt to put some sense into his faith. This is because by necessity of reason and language, the creator has to possess the intent and the will to compose this system the way He chose for the purpose He chose, freely and capably! This is the very definition of "GOD"! He should possess all attributes that define a wise and capable "doer"/"creator" who gives purpose and determinate order to everything we see in this universe! Ergo, it has to be what atheists call a "Personal god" (in meaning and attributes, not in nature or properties)! It follows then that you either believe in a true God (by the true definition), or you don't! So the "deist god" is clearly nothing but the miserable position of an atheist who sees that he cannot escape the rational necessity of there being a masterful creator; yet he hates to submit to any religion that claims to express the will of that creator! So miserable indeed!

partially accepted in their view as “reasonable people”! And of course if they were to let go of it entirely and join the atheist camp as “ex-Muslims”, they will be their heroes!

Well, I’m not into analyzing the motives of the author! Yet I shall not discard certain keys and signs that will help the reader go as deep as possible within an atheist’s mind! I remind my reader that I’m not merely in the business of refuting a number of feeble philosophical arguments here! Those meanings – however - are further revealed in later sections that are yet to come near the end of Dawkins’ book (discussed mostly in Volume 2).

So as for this broad claim he makes here, let’s examine those attributes he finds “*absolutely no reason*” to ascribe to the creator!

In order to answer to this claim let me assume for now – for the sake of the argument - that he is already standing with me on the platform that there has to be an uncreated creator at the end of the chain. He’s then claiming that there’s no reason to ascribe those attributes to that creator:

omnipotence,

Omnipotence simply means complete and perfect power and ability! How can any sane mind imagine a creator of a system who does not have total power upon – at least – everything within it? And if the very notion of power and ability in human understanding is a making of that creator Himself, and it is necessary for the sake of reverence, respect, and submission by the worshipper – the very things that give the word god itself its meaning! – that he sees His creator in no less a position than that of perfectness in this respect; how can any sane man expect from the creator of everything – man included - anything less than being perfect on all accounts and in all attributes? It was He who made man to think of an attribute like “weakness” as a negative attribute that demises its holder! So if I can – as a man – think of a creature within this universe that is more powerful than my god, more powerful than the creator of the universe Himself, then how can I revere and respect – hence take for a god – that creator that I worship when I know that it is not at the reasonably necessary rank of total power and control of everything? How can I reason an ‘incomplete being’ to be the creator of everything that is created? This is not possible!

omniscience,

Same goes here! I cannot think of a creator of a system who does not possess complete knowledge of that which he created, can you professor?

This inclination to mold the creator in a cast of human (anthropomorphic) limitedness and incapability and to analogize Him in the nature of His attributes to man, is clearly and understandably the remainder of what used to be his own personal image of the creator, founded on the teachings of Christianity that he was brought up with! I can understand why it is so easy for an atheist to take this corrupt imagery and charge Christianity with being responsible for it! Because, quite simply, Christianity is indeed, – especially Catholicism and Orthodoxy – and to a great extent responsible for it, as we may further elaborate later in this book! But to take the leap of pointing the very same finger to all other religions in such a way is simply a clear sign of ignorance and bias!

goodness,

Would you, professor, rather worship an evil unjust god than one who is at the level of perfectness in goodness? I hope not! Because by creation, it was He who made his creatures reason those meanings that define that which is good in the first place, so how come He creates them all in a way that fails to see His goodness, and yet ask of them – like all religions that are ascribed to Him demand - to respect and love Him? Being the sole creator of man, his mind, and everything around him it is only rational that He should make those meanings of goodness all attributable – in the mind of every healthy man - to Himself in unequivocal perfectness! He can do that can't He? Man sees this – naturally - as part of the necessary overall perfectness of His attributes! He has to be perfectly good, because He made us to condemn every being that is bad or unjust! So He cannot have failed to make humans ascribe all goodness to Him, and true followers of His prophets respect Him! This is why we say that any religion that fails to offer clearly coherent and consistent meanings of perfection and goodness to all His attributes in this respect; is by definition not His religion! Atheists need to bear in mind that the creator not only created the universe around us; it was He who created us as well, our experiences, our minds, our reason, and the way we understand and compare different attributes and meanings! They should at least give Him the credit of knowing what He's doing!

All praise be to the Lord almighty!

Creativity of creation (design),

So you'd rather worship an uncreative designer? A creator who is less creative than some of His own creatures perhaps? Even though you can clearly see in everything around you that He can be nothing less than perfect in this respect? (And please do not raise the objection of why there has to be pain, war, mutations, and so forth, because we will come to that later on!)

"Absolutely no reason", he says!

Listening to prayers, forgiving sins

The professor objects to this attribute as it is to him an example of what he calls "human attributes"! If such reasoning was valid professor, then actually all attributes are human attributes as well, aren't they? Even creation itself, and the purpose behind it, would – according to this reasoning of yours – be a human deed coming out of human attributes! Actually the very meaning of there being a willful creator itself should also qualify as such! The chain of causes has to end at a purposeful creator, so it's either a "personal God" who does what He pleases (sharing the meanings of these attributes with humans), or an infinite regress that destroys causality altogether!

And thus the rational question here should be: By what criterion of reason have you chosen to call these particular attributes: "human"?!

Because they provoke a human image in your mind of a man in heaven, lowering his head here and there to listen to people's prayers? Because you cannot think of a being that "listens" to prayers and forgives sins unless that being was "human"? Who said that there is any necessity of reason that links between the creator being capable of "listening" to His creatures – for example – and His being in any human – or similar - form or nature? This is absolutely false! The WAY we listen; is not by any necessity of reason the same WAY the creator listens! And the mere fact that He does listen, doesn't make this attribute "human"! In fact reason necessitates that there's no way it can be analogous to the way creatures listen! Obviously the creator should have the power to observe all, and listen to all simultaneously! One cannot imagine His being omnipotent and in full domain over His creation, while there's the slightest possibility that something may come to take place in the universe without His seeing it, listening to it, and knowing it fully! The meaning of omnipotence itself – which is already a necessity of reason for Him – necessitates His being capable of seeing all and listening to all, simultaneously! It actually necessitates that the very meaning of time itself does not limit Him in any way! Thus it follows by simple reason that none of

His attributes should be viewed in analogy to corresponding attributes in humans!

In the Quran we are told that He sees all, hears all, knows all, even more, we are told that He has a hand, eye, finger, and so forth! However, we are also told that there's absolutely nothing like Him!: ***((Naught is as His likeness; and He is the hearer, the seer)))*** Translation of Quran (42|11)

This verse is a rule of thumb that actually separates the rightful followers of the prophet and his disciples (the Salaf) (I.e. Ahlul sunnah wal jama'a) in the way they understand scripture of Islam, from almost every other sect of innovators (i.e: Mutazilites, Shee'ites, Ash'arites, … etc!). The distinction comes from the fact that, while innovators were – like Dr. Dawkins here – influenced by philosophers in holding the opposite extreme position to the pagan view of a deity that is human – sometimes even animal in form! -, those who seek authentic references of knowledge in Islam and seek to obtain the correct understanding of the disciples as the only reliable source for understanding Islamic scripture correctly, find no contradiction and no trouble at all in ascribing those attributes to the Lord the way they are ascribed in the Quran and in Sunnah!

The rationale is this: His having a hand – for example – by no means necessitates that this hand be viewed as a limb or a "part" or an "organ" or be in anyway anything "like" a creature's hand! The meaning is not at all rationally objectionable! Whatever attribute of His that we learn from an evidently authentic source of scripture [4], we treat it in this exact same manner!

Reason necessitates that His attributes – all of them with no exception – undergo the golden rule of the Quran that there's nothing like Him! The reasons behind this debate among Muslim scholars who followed those philosophical innovations in Islam, and the evidence that we use to prove them all WRONG, is not our concern here. I only had to point out for every sane reader that those objections the professor poses here are not at all new to Muslim scholars, and ever since the first three centuries of Islam, scholars have been answering them in a clear and consistent way, with nothing but rational and scriptural evidence! However, it is a universal law that there be

[4] Remember that I'm speaking at the level of examining scripture on the presumed basis that we already agree on the necessity of there being a creator! It was the professor's leap into the question of (human) attributes that drove me to do this

innovations and people who call unto them, for a reason that has to do with the wisdom and purpose of the creation of life itself, which is another issue; topic for another discussion in another section of this literature.

The point is; if I have come to the rational conclusion that there has to be a creator, and that this creator is indeed and by necessity an omnipotent creator, with nothing less than perfectness in all His attributes, and then I have identified by means of evidence – not blind faith - what volume of scripture on this earth is indeed His word, and the teaching of His true prophets, and in those evidently authentic scriptures I found that creator describing Himself and ascribing certain attributes to Himself; I thus must accept those attributes as they are, since by necessity of reason I should expect them not to collide with anything that reason necessitates for Him! And the case here is that none of those attributes mentioned by the professor collides with what reason necessitates for the almighty creator, and they certainly do not necessitate any "*human*" resemblance, not in the pagan sense or in any other sense for that matter!

Many people have the problem of mixing the meaning of an attribute, with the way, or the nature it is manifested in the thing or the being it is attributed to! The meaning that I have the ability to see, for example, is one issue, and the question of HOW I can see, is another! We may agree that a certain species of birds – for example – has the ability to determine its path of flight and orientation for long distances, but we may – at the same time - lack any knowledge of how those birds do that!

So we accept the MEANING of this property or attribute to those birds, both rationally and by means of observation, but we do not know the WAY or the exact nature of this property!

Not knowing the latter, does not necessitate denial of the first!

A fly can see, and it does have an eye, doesn't it? Yes indeed! And so do we! So, in meaning; both humans and flies have the attribute of eyesight! And they both have what is to be called an eye! But does this mean that the way or the nature of a human's eye has to be analogous to that of a fly's eye? No, it doesn't!

Now if such is the case with the property of the sight, and the possession of an eye, in two species of creatures that are equal in their general physical nature and their submission to the laws of this universe; what would you expect, my reader, of the creator of the entire system Himself, who is in no

way of reason anywhere close – in His likeness - to humans or to any of His creatures, and who is by necessity of reason unlike anything any man has ever seen or could possibly imagine (out of reach of any humanly affordable analogy)?

So yes, reason necessitates all perfectness and completeness in all attributes of the Lord, and it does not find any acceptable reason to deny Him those attributes, or to claim them to necessitate any form of human analogy whatsoever! We accept the meaning of those attributes, and refrain from attempting to imagine or understand their 'nature' or the way they work!

As I mentioned earlier, as a Muslim I fully understand where the professor's position comes from! It is that of a former Christian, or at least one who was raised in a Christian household or a Christian society, and who once had to ask himself – like I suppose most Christians do one way or another at a certain point in their lives: "How do they claim the creator of all this majesty to be in the form of a superhuman white-bearded father up in heaven; one who regrets, changes his mind, sacrifices his own son unjustly when he really doesn't have to, and so forth? How come he begets a son in the first place, and to have him crucified and resurrected for the sake of the very same creatures he once flooded mercilessly? And to be three gods and one god at the same time… and they still claim him to be *perfect*? The myth is clearly badly written!"

And he is certainly right! Such clear paganism cannot coincide with meanings of ultimate knowledge, wisdom, power, grace, and so forth! The very faith in the trinity – the heart of what Christians believe – is clearly a claim of a meaning – not talking about the **ways** here but the **meaning** itself – that cannot be swallowed by any sane mind! Its mathematical expression is quite simply this: (3 = 1)! Not (1x1x1 = 1) by the way as some priests would so easily claim! This is not the logical meaning of multiplication!

Many Christians would argue that if He is omnipotent, and we cannot understand His nature, then we must find no trouble in accepting the meaning that He can be as such: three in one and one in three! I hope we can now see clearly where this argument goes wrong! Since we cannot understand the Means or the WAY he does what he does, then we cannot object to the MEANING of the trinity! I say no we certainly can, and we should!

If our minds cannot accept the meaning itself, then it's irrelevant to speak of the **way** it happens or the nature of it as though our lack of knowledge of this

nature would affect our position regarding the meaning in any way! It's simply a FALSE MEANING! So there's NO WAY for it to be true! It's just like believing that God exists and does not exist at the same time! There is no reasonable argument that since God is omnipotent then He must be capable of doing this, one way or another! This is rationally impossible!

The trinity is possibly one of the clearest anti-rational arguments ever known to man! And they – Christians - are not the first to make it up in history by the way; history has known many trinities before this one! Many pagan faiths of old met with the very same dilemma! They have three gods, but at the same time they have every reason to believe that there can only be one supreme god, lord creator and keeper of all; not three! So there comes the trinity to say it's okay to have it both ways! The deity is both: Three gods and one god at the same time!

So, all in all, Dawkins is right to see that this faith is offering his mind a pagan imagery of a human god, and a core attribute the very meaning of which is clearly false! Thus I totally understand where it is coming from when he claims – following whoever he chooses to follow on that claim – that those attributes he mentioned imply or necessitate analogy to humans, or draw the pagan imagery of a superhuman god!

However, he has no right at all, to generalize his deductions in such a way that makes it appear to the uninformed as though all religions endorse such paganism! He *knows* that Islam condemns those meanings forcefully!

I hope that as I proceed with this book, my reader will start realizing how much knowledge the professor lacked and still needed to possess in order to acquire the position where he can so easily generalize all his comments and criticism on all "religion" the way he does! He's either a man who doesn't know the first thing about Islam – which is very unlikely – or a man who insists on lying to himself and to his readers regarding the reasons why he rejects it and places it in the same basket with all other religions! He lies to himself when he holds – like most western atheists do - that Islam is only a derivative from Christianity and Judaism, and that refuting Christianity would be enough to refute Islam as well! As a respectable scholar one would have expected from professor Dawkins to practice a sound process of scholarly research and induction as he approaches such an extremely dangerous territory of the human knowledge! However, it comes to none of my surprise that he doesn't; after all he is indeed a man of blind unfounded

faith who bears not upon evidence, but upon whatever theory that comes to his liking! No offense intended!

***And reading* innermost thoughts**

Yes! How can you deny Him the ability to know what's going on in the mind of one of His creatures? He MADE this mind and gave it to you! Whatever could be wrong with claiming Him to be in complete and thorough knowledge of everything that runs in it? It is silly how an atheist would object saying: "How can he possibly listen to all the thoughts of all humans at the same time?" I would answer by saying: Your not knowing how it happens does not render the meaning itself irrational! There's much in the universe that I – by necessity of observation – accept as a fact without really knowing HOW it happens! To me, a simple mind thinking with the very basics of human reason; a creator capable of creating and maintaining such an infinitely complex universe, MUST have nothing in His creation that falls out of His knowledge or out of His control at any given moment; our innermost thoughts and secrets included! This is a meaning that I accept so easily, and I can think of nothing less for Him! But to ask me "how" and to make the ability to explain the way He does that, a condition for accepting this rational necessity as an attribute to the creator; this is like saying I will not believe in God until I see him with my own eyes; not only so, but until I manage to test and examine him in my lab!

Praise be the Lord of heaven and earth!

And again I can easily see that the professor is objecting and denying simply because he is uncomfortable with the idea that there's somebody watching Him from above, knowing everything he says or does wherever he goes! This is the ultimate drive here, because quite obviously there is not an ounce of evidence or any rational objection whatsoever by which those attributes could be refuted, or by which any sane man could expect anything less of the creator!

In his next argument the professor vainly attempts to prove a contradiction between two of those major attributes. He says:

> *"Incidentally, it has not escaped the notice of logicians that omniscience and omnipotence are mutually incompatible. If God is omniscient, he must already know how he is going to intervene to*

change the course of history using his omnipotence. But that means he can't change his mind about his intervention, which means he is not omnipotent. Karen Owens has captured this witty little paradox in equally engaging verse:

Can omniscient God, who

Knows the future, find

The omnipotence to

Change His future mind?"

Omniscience gentlemen, is – in its very clear meaning – the complete and total knowledge of all: every single event along the course of history included, from day Zero all the way to the end! This means that all decisions and choices of the Lord were previously made, even before the act of creation![5] The universe is now taking an already determined path! Thus, the question of "changing the mind" is clearly irrelevant! It is only the property of a being that is limited in knowledge! Changing one's mind comes from the realization that the first choice was wrong or imperfect; hence it has to be changed! Perhaps because he did not expect the outcome of the decision or because he did not see all that shall be affected by it! In all cases it comes from the position of need or obligation to make a better choice! Either the previous choice had to be changed, or would better be changed; which in all cases means lack of wisdom and knowledge in making the first one! Otherwise; why change it?

I am amazed at how they failed to realize that the very meaning of changing the mind, contradicts fundamentally with the meaning of omniscience! It has nothing to do with omnipotence! To ask "Can the Lord change His mind?" is just like asking: Can the Lord forget? Can the lord kill Himself?

If I answered to any of these questions by a clear NO, is it by any means rational to take this answer to mean that He is not omnipotent, because

[5] There is authentic scripture of Hadith that actually teaches that Allah first created the PEN, and told it to right down all that shall come to pass since the first day of creation and all the way to the end! There is scriptural evidence for the fact that Allah had laid down the plan of all that is going to be in this universe, some fifty thousand years before its creation!

there's something that He "can't" do? This is nonsense! Omnipotence has nothing to do with meanings that are rationally impossible!

Thus we can see that the question presented here is clearly false!

There are many similar examples of a rationally false Question…

Q: Can the Lord create an equal to Himself?

A: The Question is false, simply because He is an eternal uncreated being; and an eternal uncreated being cannot be created! Thus the creation of His likeness is – in meaning - a rational impossibility!

Q: Can the Lord throw a man out of His Kingdom?

A: False Question! There is simply no place in existence that is outside of His dominion or His knowledge! So it's a rational impossibility!

Q: Can the Lord create a stone He cannot carry?

A: False Question, because anything He creates must – by necessity – be under His power as well! Something that is impossible in meaning is simply not "creatable", and is irrelevant to the Lord's omnipotence! An omnipotent creator, who can create anything, can also *carry* anything! And since there's no limit to His power, then this is a rational impossibility!

Q: Being the one who created something from nothingness; Can the Lord see or know something that is not there (nothingness)?

A: False Question! Nothingness is not "something" to be seen or known; a rational impossibility! A "nothing" is not "something" to be known!

…… etc.!

You can think of as many such "nonsensical" questions as you wish!

The author then exclaims:

> *"To return to the infinite regress and the futility of invoking God to terminate it, it is more parsimonious to conjure up, say, a 'big bang singularity', or some other physical concept as yet unknown. Calling it God is at best unhelpful and at worst perniciously misleading."*

'Best' and 'worst' for what exactly? For a man's blind ambition to obtain knowledge of something he can very clearly not acquire? Science is a process of examination and explanation of CREATED things by means of analogy. The material of this process; its givens, the givens to our perception, are those elements of this very system surrounding us, as they are; as we see them, as we experience them! Our current recurring experience of natural phenomena is what defines the way we think of nature!

The methods and ways that we see are the only methods and ways we can afford to reason and attempt to explain, by means of analogy! Now to ask of this tool of science and reason to aid us in discovering how the universe came to be at its very beginning, we are actually committing a rational mistake, because we are asking this tool of analogy that is naturally limited by its perceptual input to already created things, to apply to a process that must – by necessity – have involved methods and ways that are like none we have ever perceived, to be created and originated!

The birth of a star or a solar system, the death of a planet, the fact that the universe is expanding, … etc., none of those observable pieces of the universe and its ongoing processes that we see today could ever tell us HOW exactly the universe itself came to be! Because prior to it, there must have been something that is fundamentally different from anything we have ever seen! Either nothingness or just something else! Something that is not of this universe, or not bound by its rules!

So this process of change from 'no universe', to 'this universe', includes by necessity events that cannot be analogized to anything that we now see or comprehend in the universe itself! Please note that when I speak of analogy I also include mathematical formulation and expression! Equations in mathematical physics are forged in expression of philosophical theories; they don't *prove* them or *validate* them! So when a physicist makes a

theoretical claim, his mathematics is every bit as hypothetical as the claim itself!

Thus I argue that even the Big Bang theory; that "Booming" theory venerated by many today as a "*fact of science*" is simply another hypothesis that lacks any rational – not to mention empirical – proof, and more essentially, it is not falsifiable; there's no possibility of ever proving or disproving it as a **fact**! **Moreover there is the rational necessity that whatever went on at the origin of this universe; cannot be analogized to any process that is part of the way the universe itself is currently observed to work!** The way a car is manufactured, obviously cannot be explained by analogy to any of the events that take place in the car itself, like the way the spark plug works or the way the internal combustion engine starts! We are speaking of an event that brought all those elements together and originated the system that is known as the car!

A great majority of brilliant scientists can hardly – indeed – make that essential distinction between a theory that comes from a reasonable analogy and we could look forward to proving or disproving it rationally or by means of observation, and a theory that addresses such areas of knowledge that are simply out of the reach of science; areas where no analogy to anything we have ever seen can be made, and no observation could ever verify any manmade assumption in this respect! And while one family of scientific theories is indeed beneficial to mankind; the other is far more destructive to man's mind and soul than any doctrine of false religion, as we shall come to elaborate. It is about time that the scope of science was redefined, for the salvation of a miserable mankind that has come to think of the simplest of rational necessities as a difficult dilemma that needs intensive work of 'scientific research' to be solved!

The origin of the universe is NOT a problem that scientists should seek to solve! Man could never manage to acquire any valuable knowledge in this regard through the scientific method, no matter how hard he tries!

Scientists have got to learn the natural limits of their device! But they will only do that when they have acknowledged the purpose of their existence

itself in the first place! They should first admit that since they did not bring themselves in this world, and they did not earn those tools at birth; it is not up to them to decide on why they are here, and why they have those tools! But that's the heart and soul of the problem with atheism, isn't it?! A stubborn denial that stands on no reasonable grounds whatsoever!

This is the way our scientific method works: You see a phenomenon, propose an explanation for that phenomenon, and expand that explanation to cover other analogous phenomena, and on doing so, and as you expand the umbrella of the mother theory, you feel more satisfied with it, and it appears to be more likely than not, to be a good explanation! Now that's alright as long as the objects of this analogy are all parts of the very same system. But when the umbrella is made to expand its analogies to an area that is – by necessity of reason – not of this system, or to cover elements that are – by necessity of reason – un-analogous to anything we could possibly see or observe in this universe; this is by all means an insult to the human mind, and an offense to the scientific method itself! This is not what it was made to do! You don't use a 'table fork' to drink soup or to dig a hall in the ground or to cut down a tree, do you?! Wisdom is putting everything in its right place, and that's something that western scientific academia does not possess!

The problem with atheist scientists of modern times is that in their desperate need – as human beings - to obtain knowledge in those areas, and because of their unshakable faith that it is only through the scientific method that such knowledge is to be obtained; they have committed some of the greatest crimes ever committed against human reason and against science itself. They maintained that their theories in this area (the area of origins) are proven true by the mere accumulation of a multitude of proposed explanations of different phenomena that can be synthesized from those theories, even though they know that the very basis upon which those mother theories of origins stand is rationally challenged! In their enthusiasm they even went to as far as saying that since we have managed to propose all those 'simplistic explanations' to the origins of natural life by means of natural selection, and we can explain all fossil findings accordingly, and since creation on the

other hand gives us no such explanation that goes with the way we see things work in this universe; therefore creation is false, and Darwin was right! In their blind ambition they fail to realize that Darwin's theory – by its very name – only describes a process of **change**, not of origination! They took the observations of the way natural life changes for the purpose of adaptation and other reasons, and claimed that this is how life itself came to be on this Earth! And even though they know that the rational grounds for this analogy are absolutely counter-rational, they claim that only because of the number of phenomena they have been *capable* of *explaining* by this analogy itself, and since it has become mainstream in academic circles; the theory is to be qualified as a FACT, or at least an explanation that is far more "probable" than creation!

And now we have people debating on the "*probability* or *improbability* of creation" as though it were a proposition of 'science' that is yet to be *proven*! They went further to claim that those phenomena themselves are EVIDENCE for evolution and natural selection! The mere fact that the ape looks like a man is *evidence* that they both had evolved from a common ancestor! The mere fact that amphibians can live both on land and in water is *evidence* that its ancestors lived in the sea, and that some of its relatives evolved into reptiles! Natural phenomena – in themselves – are now taken so bluntly as EVIDENCE for the Darwinian story of origins! And when they are asked they say, creation does not give us such "scientific explanations" of the origins of those things, so it is not science![6]

Well we never said creation was 'science'! We did not hypothesize creation! We only say it's the perfectly rational truth! It is you – Darwinian atheists - who are driven by blind irrational faith to push 'scientific theorization' to a place where it obviously cannot go, to have yourselves convinced that it is a superior source of knowledge on those essential questions to anything that

[6] At this point they would often contend that the science that deals with the origin of life is not Darwin's evolution; it's a branch called "abio-genesis", whereas Darwinism is not concerned with how life itself came to emerge! And in response we remind them that Darwinism was the concept that spawned (abiogenesis) theorization as essential key to the chronicle! The idea of a single ancestral being is the proposition of Darwinism, and the theories dealing with the problem of how that being was composed, are only the extension of Darwin's conception and his notion of chance-driven events that yielded working systems, which accumulated gradually in evolution.

religions have to offer! There could be tens of possibilities on how – for example – man came to be on this Earth; the truth among which could never be known by such blind analogies! Not in a billion years of theorization and not with ten tons of fossil findings could the knowledge of our exact origins be achieved! And when your theory goes against fundamental rational and semiotic necessities; then whatever you call evidence is simply futile, no matter how many explanations it gives that you may view as "plausible", "simplistic" or "Scientific"!

The problem we have now with contemporary atheists (Darwinians) is that they are trying with all their intellectual powers to prove their position by means of such "scientific evidence"! Observations that could be explained by their adopted theories and beliefs just as they could be explained by other hypotheses; are now made into PROOF for the nonexistence of a creator!

For example, the Cosmic Microwave Background which is currently viewed to be evidence that supports the Big Bang theory, is considered to be so only because the pattern the "fog" takes looks similar – one way or another - to the one that could be expected from the "blow up" of Red-Hot Gases in open space! Similar in what exactly? In apparent 'randomness'? In the uninformed eyes of a human beholder, this is a phenomenon that might as well be explained by an infinite number of possible explanations, other than the position of favor in Cosmology today; that the Universe started out as a dense body that just 'exploded'! However, while they explain this pattern by the Big Bang Model, they would easily – in a different discourse – take it to be evidence to PROVE the Big Bang is true! There is no consideration as they present this 'evidence' of how a blind BANG could happen – by pure chance – to place the Earth and all celestial bodies around it in such a perfectly balanced position in space, in a way that is perfectly tuned for the benefit of life on Earth! No wondering for a moment on how possibly such an unbelievably perfect system could originate and then get all physical and chemical variables preserved and maintained at those exact perfect values, not a bit higher or lower, all by means of an unguided, unplanned *explosion*! An explosion is nothing but a phenomenon of destructive blast that results from certain changes that take place in an unstable system within this

universe, in accordance with the laws of this universe itself; so by what miserable disconcerting analogy could this physical event of destruction that takes place in a balanced theme of natural forces in an already stabilized universe, be taken as a model to explain the way this perfect universe itself (with all its laws and conditions) came into being?

Notice that I'm talking about the kind of proof that should get a reasonable man convinced that this marvel of a universe was not **created** at all; it was only a ball of matter that just exploded!

The Big Bang remains to be no more than a hypothetical Model of favor in current circles of Astronomy, that attempts to explain an event that cannot by any argument of reason be known with reliable evidence through analogy to anything we can now observe!

As a matter of fact, Georges Lemaitre, who was the first to propose it, was clear in calling it "the hypothesis of the primeval atom"! A hypothesis; like most such theories are!

They'd say: "It was confirmed by particle accelerator experiments!"

I say; no it was not! When experiments were performed on particle accelerators, what did their results really prove? Did they prove the universe to have actually originated out of a Big Bang? No! They only proved that it might be one of endless possibilities, and that on succeeding in copying those conditions that we see in nature, in a lab, we will most probably have similar results in the lab to those we currently see in nature: An already indisputable axiom of causality, one that certainly didn't need to have so much money and time wasted on the purpose of proving it!

And after all, they only proved that this process to be possible WITHIN the system of the universe as it is (in lab conditions, as well as anywhere else in the universe)! But they certainly did not establish any evidence to support their claim that this is indeed how the universe itself, the system itself with all its conditions and binding rules, must have originated! It is supposed to be a rational axiom or 'A-priori' law to say that the way things run in a

given system is one thing, and the way the system itself came to be is another!

You would easily listen to arguments from many prominent mathematicians and astronomers stating that since we have come to view time to “behave” as another dimension of space, we can no longer find any reason not to say that any evolutionary model that is currently observable in progress, might as well work to explain the origins of the Universe itself!

What are they talking about? This is illusion of reason; not reason! This is not a statement of science; it is the wishful thinking of a deluded scientist! What is a dimension? What is time? And what is space? They would repeatedly bring forth the term “Spacetime” as though they’re talking about some weird physical phenomenon they have recently discovered that supports their corrupt reasoning!

Space-time is only a mathematical system of coordinates that REPRESENTS events rather than objects, due to the inclusion of time as an additional “dimension” to the three dimensions of space! That’s all! It’s only a model for plotting events on a mathematical plane! A camera that records motion in a numerical media! How can this tool itself or the graphical presentation it offers, be used to claim “time” to be – indeed – any different in its meaning from the way every sane man observes it to be: Just a scalar measure of the progress of events in space, that we humans quantify by relating all observable motions to a universal standard motion (that of the sun or the moon or the atomic clock)?

What is the actual meaning of time “*behaving*” differently because of its being treated as a new dimension of space? And in what way does this change our understanding of what time really is? Relativity does indeed cause this confusion to those fascinated by its conception of time! They are so fascinated and fueled by science fiction stories that they forget along the way many basic meanings and mix them up, proposing theories many of which are no more worthy of consideration than any mythological story of the gods of the Olympus! I’m in no opposition at all to being inspired by a science fiction novel! However, if this novel is actually imagining something

that is a rational impossibility or that collides with facts established by observation or reason; it is to be taken for no more than valueless farce! It is not to be taken for a possibility of "science" that might fuel a scientist's ambition!

For example they would say that since relativity proved that time is relative and can be dilated, in a space-time Model they would start dealing with time as though it is something that might as well be reversed, or even stopped, thus to them, relativity "proves" the possibility of "time travel" and other similar irrationalities of science fiction novelists! Watch the sequence of this reasoning! The variable of time (t) or (dt) they are toying with in their equations, which expresses the relativistic time, is only the mathematical expression of the progress of events within a particular model of space-time; a particular frame of reference! So when they start viewing it to express the universal progress of time, they have to be careful what motion exactly it expresses; for it is right there that the error of reasoning takes place, causing the deduction of false theories concerning time!

If I reversed the motion of a few beads on my table for example, then perhaps I might then take the liberty of saying that I "reversed time", or moved them back in time! This is because by time I mean: the relative measure of progress of events or motion within this particular frame of reference! I only reversed a state of motion or a sequence of events of a particular set of elements, relative to my own frame of reference; that's what I did! If ever any conception of reversing time or going back in time could be reasoned; that might be it!

However, to speak of moving back in time, in the sense of riding some "time-machine" and being capable of meeting with your dead father or grandfather, or even examining the truth about the origin of life and so forth; this is just impossible! Because quite simply it means that we think we could one day be capable of moving **the entire universe** with everything in it in reverse, like rewinding a video tape, so that we could reach that point in "time" when a certain event took place! Physicists have got to snap out of this nonsense and realize that this point **no longer exists**, because quite simply, the particles that where once in the past composed in the way they

were in that particular instant, are now composed in a totally different way, and the distance between those two instants on the watches we carry on our wrists is our way of measuring the unstoppable motion of all those particles in the universe, as they progress each on its own path!

So that instant, defined as a previous state of composition of all particles of matter in the universe: just doesn't exist in reality anymore! It's **nowhere** to be revisited! To go to the future or to the past, you are speaking of the acceleration or the reverse of the progression of motion of all particles that exist in the universe on the path that was strictly determined for them by none but the creator Himself! In addition to this, you are also speaking of splitting yourself apart from the system by necessity; which is impossible because particles of the universe are restricted to the very same laws to which your own particles are restricted! In the past, before you were born; particles of your body where in billions of different places, and in the future they will be scattered all around the world just as they were before they were gathered in your body! So for you to go to the future or to the past it means that each one of your particles will exist at two places at the same time; in you, and wherever you left it when you died, or in you and wherever it was before you were born, or in you and in another you that was or will still be alive at that time you're "visiting"; which is – very obviously - rationally impossible! In a simple mathematical expression it actually means (0=1), or (1=2) at best! Your body is restricted to the path of progress of the universe just as everything else; there's no changing that! There's no "transcending" this restriction to the path of destiny that will become history just as the Lord intended for it, it's going just the way He determined whether we like it or not! The question of choice and destiny is another issue that I will come to discuss in 'Volume 2', my point here is; time travel is only a fool's dream of assuming the position of the creator Himself, taking the upper hand over whatever power that keeps the universe running the way it is!

Yet, today I know of many physicists who are actually taking the creation of a time machine for a goal! And they do not call this "science fiction"

anymore! [7] And even though the rational corruption of the basic meanings implied by time travel is very obvious to any sensible man; ignorance regarding the creator and lack of heavenly wisdom let those people drown in nonsensical theories and interpretations that are orders of magnitude more "pseudoscientific" than astrology!

Atheism coupled with a wild imagination is the perfect combination for such a "cartoonish" damage to the mind of a decent human being, and for having him waste his entire meaningless life working – under a tag of science – on something as lunatic as the dream of building a "Time Machine" so he could go bring his father back from the dead! But this is no worse than the rest of their belief system anyway, is it? They dream to go back "there" and relive the past, perhaps save people they loved from death, and have destiny go just the way they like; but the fools have failed to realize that there is no "there" to go to in the first place! In simple human language, "When" and "where" are two rationally distinct **meanings**, none of which could be used interchangeably! This is an illusion! A pseudoscientific interpretation of mathematical dimensions and models of mathematical presentation of space and time, resulting in a fundamentally false conception of basic linguistic meanings!

I really hate to disappoint all those teenagers fascinated with the theory of relativity who take it for a goal of life to one day be capable of inventing the (time-machine)! This is just not science; it is corrupt philosophy!

They forget that time is only a measure of motion, and it is relative only because the way we observe and measure motion is relative! Relativity is only in the way we see things, not in the way they really are! Einstein did not come up with a new discovery about the universe or about time, he

[7] It's such a pity to listen to someone like Michio Kaku, a famed professor of physics at City College in New York, argue in a TV show entitled 'Science of the impossible' (just look at the title of the show!), in response to Stephen Hawking's objection to time travel saying "maybe time travelers are all around us but they're just invisible so we can't see them!", (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RnkE2yQPw6s) or to watch a brilliant scientist like (Ronald Mallett), an established professor of physics at the university of Connecticut, waste his lifetime along with those of many other students and colleagues, in addition to endless resources and funds, on a wild dream to actually travel through time, on the hope that one day he might be able to bring his dead father back to life! (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DnLIxEso4rg) It's such a pity that the so called (grandfather paradox) or (autoinfanticide) is only viewed as a 'paradox', one to which a good solution may one day be discovered! Such a pity indeed!

simply drew the attention of physicists to the fact that the way they measure and quantify things in the universe is **relative**, not absolute as it was previously viewed to be! In that, he did not CHANGE our understanding of what time, space or gravitation are in reality, or what meanings they express, he rather altered the way we *model* them!

You'd think that scientists do make the distinction between the nature and purpose of the tool they are using, and the true nature of the phenomena they are applying it to! Unfortunately, they no longer do!

Theoretical Physicists and mathematicians really need to stop drawing charts and studying maps and plots for a while, raise their eyes to the sky and revise the basic norms of human reason, and the actual meanings of the core variables they are trying to measure! They need to sit back and revise what mathematics really is, what it is for, and what it can, and cannot do! What meanings can or cannot be deduced from a mathematical presentation of time and space, is indeed a serious question of reason – or philosophy as it were – that demands attention! It demands addressing before a physicist or a mathematician could jump into statements like the one I presented above!

The concept of the Big Bang attempts an analogy of the process that caused the entire universe with all its systems as we see them to come into being (as distinct as it naturally should be from any process we have ever observed), to an "explosion" that we see taking place here and there as part of many cosmic processes running within the universe itself. This analogy is by all means wrong! It's what sages of Islam would call (an incomplete analogy, or analogy with a difference!); such analogy is corrupt and cannot be taken for evidence.

Some might object here and say: "But this is not what we claim the theory to do! We do understand that it only describes what has been going on steadily starting from a particular instant before which we still know nothing and can prove nothing! We do admit it does next to nothing in explaining the initial event" I would then wonder: "So why speak of it as a "bang" at all? Isn't the term "bang" a description that you propose for that particular event you say you know nothing about? There once was a very dense body of mass and

energy that just "exploded", giving rise to the universe as we know it today! This statement sums it all up! So by what means of reason can you drive this process and claim it to have been going as such, ever since the first event, and call that first event a bang, and then claim so easily that the theory has nothing to do with the initial event that originated the universe?

It is even interesting enough that one of the models they propose to explain the advent of the universe, is what they call "the Oscillatory universe" which simply – and so boldly – claims the universe to be a bulk of mass and energy that passes through endlessly oscillating cycles – endless from both sides, past and future – of expansion and collapse. It explodes, and its pieces keep moving away from one another, until at a certain point they stop moving apart from each other and start to move in reverse, shrinking all the way back to a crunch, and then explode again, over and over! They make this claim on the grounds that we have seen objects in the universe explode, and other objects collapse to a very dense body!

One has no choice but wonder here; if they claim that this currently ongoing process could one day come to a point of seizure and start reversing – due to the effect of gravitation or dark energy or negative matter or whatever they wish to call it! – then how could they – in the first place – speak as though they know that at any given moment in the far history before the present, no such seizure or any similar cosmic event that may destroy the model of the ongoing expansion itself, ever took place? They don't, and they never will!

So letting the question of the very first origin aside, it is clear that even the very claim that the universe expansion necessitates an initially single mass, is obviously one that stands totally un-provable!

Well, I say, to jump to the claim that this process of explosion – expansion – seizure – shrinking – and collapse is an endlessly repeating cycle; is as much of a fairy tale as any ancient myth they so fervently ridicule! The only difference is in the fact that one of them takes the form and taste of "science" while the other carries a tag that says: "religion"! Thus one of them is said to be human "enlightenment" while the other is utter "backwardness"!

We watch pieces of the universe going apart from one another (supposing that this is what's actually going on!)… Okay, so how do we know that this has always been the case? Yes if we have no reason to believe otherwise, no counter evidence, it would only make sense that we make this assumption; to presume a standard linear path for this stance that we currently observe and take its current motion to have always been taking this particular pattern that we see, and no other! This notion is fundamental to a science like geology, in principle. But how can we use this method of deduction to explain the origin of the universe itself, and to claim that it was a 'Bang' that started off this pattern of expansion?

This is like a little ant, looking at a train running on its tracks, capturing it at the instant when it starts accelerating at its departure from the station, and saying in conclusion: "Well, we, the ants, conclude that at the current rate of acceleration, this object will reach the speed of light after some hundred thousand years or so, and would have probably gone half way across the solar system by then!"

The mere fact that the universe is currently expanding at whatever rate, does not prove this "Bang" to be the event responsible for the origination of the universe! Moreover, the Bang does not answer the question of the origin, for we would still have some initial body – the one that exploded in the bang – we do not know how it came to be or where it came from, or even what it was that held it in its place in infinite space! Whatever any theorist may attempt to propose in this respect, will ultimately lead him to nothing but regress, which should lead him eventually, whether he likes it or not, to an initial act of creation by an external creator (first cause) that is not bound to those laws to which the regress itself is restricted; which are laws of which He is the ultimate source!

So no matter what any man will ever come up with in attempt to explain the origins of the universe, it will be nothing but fantasy; speculation at best! Why? Because there's no way we can prove or disprove anything there!

I know that such a disappointing statement may very well come to the condemnation and dislike of many cosmologists and astrophysicist but this

doesn't mean it's not true! If there is a single statement by Richard Dawkins that I really appreciate, it's his repeated emphasis in many debates and public appearances on the fact that the truth doesn't have to come to our liking! If only *he* were true to this meaning, personally; he wouldn't continue to be an atheist for a single minute!

Many scientists have blind ambition to perhaps score the Noble Prize and go down in history as the first man to propose a plausible theory that explains the origin of the universe! Even though they know in advance that there's no way anybody can prove anything there by means of science; they'd continue to call it science and chase it nonetheless! Are they simply trying to fabricate a substitute to religious faith in creation that would have people believe it automatically just because it is taught in science classes? It is obvious that this is the true motive they stand upon, as I will come to elaborate in later sections! It is now an actual war between atheists and Christians over science education in American schools! If it was not a position of faith on the part of atheists, why then do they hate so much to have children taught that the universe was created, or even that evolution – every single bit as they explain it - was triggered and guided by a transcendent intelligent being of some sort? That would only be an additional hypothesis to their theories on the origins of natural life, not a substitution! I mean what if a theorist – not a Christian by necessity - claimed – for example – that God created the universe, set the laws into it, and tuned all the conditions necessary for the story of evolution to be triggered and to continue throughout the ages the way Darwinians believe it did? Do they have any scientific argument to deny this possibility? No they don't! And yet they'd fight it so hard all the same! And even though it has been argued that even the story of evolution itself and the detailed paths that it took, as it is told today, is nothing short of a MIRACLE, hence necessitating an intelligent agent nonetheless; they're not even remotely willing to give this meaning the least amount of thought, not to mention let it be acknowledged in text books of science as a "theory"! Why?

Well, the reason is obvious: They chose to believe in Darwinism only so they could dismiss any form of belief in God! They took Darwinism for the

scientific “evidence” that supports their atheistic faith! So they NEED to take Darwinism to its atheist ends, and to even fight for that! And while many Christians are willing – because of their faith - to accept evolution as part of the way all creation was made by God, atheists on the other hand, and from their own position of faith; would persistently refuse to have God mentioned anywhere in the house! So it is indeed BLIND-FAITH DRIVEN theorization from both parties! It is only because of this drive of faith that atheists are so determined to forge theories of origins regardless of whether or not they could ever be proven scientifically! If the universe did originate, and is now believed not to be eternal like atheists of the past used to think, then they must have their own atheistic narrative of how it all came into being, or else they would have to accept the existence of God and the story of creation! This narrative would then be given the intellectual privilege – in Western academic circles that are dominated by atheists - of being called a theory of “science” rather than “a scriptural story of religion”!

We have this very same rational flaw (applying Uniformitarian deduction all the way up to a first origin, regardless of any opposing evidence even if it a rational necessity) in the theory of evolution! This is how it goes: Since we can see species mutating and new species emerging from interbreeding and for re-adaptation and so forth, and we can see that those species are variably proximal in form and structure; then we conclude a huge tree of ancestry for all species! We conclude that all species must have descended from a single origin by means of those particular phenomena, starting from a primitive unicellular organism! So how can they ever prove the initial point for all life to have been a primordial lake or a unicellular being? They cannot! And every experiment they ever attempted to prove it; and to bring dead matter to life has failed!

This, my respectable reader, is not science! It is mythology of the highest order!

So when somebody says: “We have *discovered* that the universe *originated* from a Big Bang” or “We now *know* that the universe came about from a big explosion” One should answer saying: “No you don’t! … You Have Not discovered that, and you do not know it!”

What led me to all this, - even though I may be repeating much of it in better detail in other sections of this book - is the bold claim by professor Dawkins that the claim of a god at the end of the regress is – according to his words – “futile”, unhelpful, misleading - … etc.!

Why futile? Well, because the belief in a creator simply puts off the flame of blind ambition within them to become historical icons of reverence in generations to follow, for answering those great questions by means of science, and to go down in history alongside Darwin and others! It simply terminates their faith, their ambitions, and probably their scientific careers! We are still waiting for the ‘Darwin of cosmology’ professor Dawkins would say! Oh yes, and millions of atheists are dreaming to become that new Darwin; for the glory of it!

It’s like when you turn off the lights in your room, deliberately, and then start searching for something there in the dark, because you think it’s more fun, more “scientific” and far more challenging and self-gratifying this way! After all who wouldn’t dream of becoming a great, or even the greatest, scientist in all human history?

It’s no surprise at all that he calls it futile!

He speaks as though by propagating the clearest and the most rational – inevitable – explanation for the origin of the universe, we are blocking “science” from achieving some of its biggest goals!

Well, no we’re not! We’re only blocking atheists from achieving THEIR personal goals and glories in scientific academia at the cost of the truth! That’s what we are indeed seeking to block! And for that, they will never give up fighting us!

Yes the concept is futile and disappointing indeed, but only in the eyes of atheist “scientists” who would dream of building their personal glory even if it be on the ruins of the truth and the fate of others, by formulating yet another myth that would come to the linking and applause of others like themselves, under a tag of science! And for that, we sure enough will deserve to be condemned and labeled: Anti-science, pseudo-science, etc! But

we don't care! It is a universal constant this struggle; one that we – Muslims - fully understand, and are fully capable of winning! The strength of the argument is clear and is there for every sane man to see and to examine for himself, no matter what they would call it!

Yes it is dark and disappointing to you professor, because all that you aspire, dream of, and work for is in this limited world, and you know that by accepting the creator in your life, you would have to watch it all go away! After all, what more could an atheist professor of biology dream of than becoming the next Darwin; even better, a braver and more revered "prophet", topping the stream that is led by all those who are glorified in his field?! Well, we on the other hand, find the concept absolutely fair, hopeful and meaningful, as we work for an evidently glorious eternity – deservedly so - that is as evident and ascertained in our knowledge as nothing that atheists have ever known!

Examine the goals and objectives of your research professor, examine them carefully and honestly before you commence with it, examine your true motives and be true to yourself, and define your end clearly and the true fruit of your work, before condemning the concept of the creator and accusing it of standing in the way of …. "*science'*!

I condemn all forms of false faith, no matter what their holders call them! And I hope that by the end of this book, the reader will have seen how deep the snake pit goes!

Next, the professor mentions the example of the regress of cutting down a steak to the smallest possible piece, and cutting down a piece of gold, determining that those are examples of "naturally terminated" regresses, since there comes a point where any further division would leave us with something else other than meat or gold! Well, by what reason is any one of these regresses comparable to those that we say are terminated by God at their end? They are obviously not! And all we have here is another attempt to blow some noise over the concept by simply saying: "well, there are some regresses that can be terminated by other means than invoking god!" And we

say: “Okay, yes there are! So what? What does this prove? And what evidence does this argument bring against the creator? “

None at all!

He comes out from the previous argument with this conclusion:

> *“It is by no means clear that God provides a natural terminator to the regresses of Aquinas”*

Some people think that by repeating terms like “By no means” “absolutely” “most certainly” and so forth, over and over again, in support of their claims, they build an autonomous conviction in the mind of their reader that may make up for their clear lack of evidence and the weakness of their position! Well, only a biased reader - a blind follower (believer) by nature - would be convinced by such means!

((***Say bring forth your evidence; if you were telling the truth))*** Translation of the Qur’an (27|64)

As a matter of fact one cannot help pondering at his delicate use of words here: “By no means CLEAR”! He knows that he cannot afford to make the statement that he has one way or another disproved the rationality of the creator being at the end of those regresses mentioned by Aquinas! So he tries his best shot at rendering the argument “unclear”!

I tell him; give me your sound definition of “natural terminator” first and I would tell you whether or not it is true that the creator offers or should offer a natural terminator to the regress! I say that, because by “natural” all atheists mean something from within the universe as part of what we call “nature” by necessity! Something they could hope to one day perceive somewhere in nature! So if this is what you professor wish to make of the creator; a part of nature itself; then no, He is NOT a “natural terminator”! And the fact that the word “supernatural” has become – in every atheist’s dictionary – synonymous to myth and superstition, does not make it by any means false to call the creator – according to this conception of the term natural -: the supernatural terminator! For that’s what necessity of reason

makes of Him! He cannot be part of nature! By the very meaning of creation, the creator is by necessity external to what He created, He is nothing like any of His creatures and is – of course - unbound to the laws He set to run and control the universe He created!

The professor then moves on to the next Aquinas argument:

> *"The Argument from Degree. We notice that things in the world differ. There are degrees of, say, goodness or perfectness. But we judge these degrees only by comparison with a maximum. Humans can be both good and bad, so the maximum goodness cannot rest in us. Therefore there must be some other maximum to set the standard for perfectness, and we call that maximum God."*

The way this argument is written here, is clearly incoherent.

First a statement is made with the fact that things in the world differ in goodness and badness in degrees. Then the author says there are degrees of perfectness … and this meaning in such a phrasing is itself questionable, because perfect is by definition: the optimum; the top of the scale! Anything below perfectness is not a "degree" of perfectness! It's simply NOT perfect! Very good, maybe, but not perfect!

Then he states that we judge those degrees by comparison to the maximum. Well, this is not particularly accurate. We know good and we know bad, and as such, when we see good that is incomplete in any way, we realize – in meaning – by comparison to other forms of better good, that it is incomplete and imperfect, with variance in degrees of that!

We, on the other hand, conclude the necessary existence of a perfect being by applying our reason on those meanings that we see around us and identify as good! And since we realize we vary in degrees of goodness, we then deduce that since our creator made us see general meanings of good and bad the way we see them, then it follows that He himself must be at the top of every single one of those meanings that He made His own creatures view to be good; namely: perfectness! He cannot create us in a way that identifies the necessity of existence of this rank, and make it impossible for us to assign it to Him!

It also follows by necessity that all general meanings that are conventionally and rationally bad; cannot be attributed to Him! This is why it is ridiculous that the professor would speak of "perfectness" in smelliness in his comment to this argument! I take it he is trying to make a serious issue "funny" by making such a gesture! I hope the reader would better realize the seriousness of the issue in hand!

Although the extreme in "bad" attributes may be called – in language – perfect at that; this is not part of what we conventionally call "perfect" or "perfectness"! When we describe something as perfect, we generally do not mean it is perfect in evil! Unless we particularly mentioned that it is perfect in evil, like "the perfect crime" for example, our minds take us to the good meaning. And it is of course not part of what we ascribe to the creator, who taught us – by the way He created our reason itself - to be repulsed and offended by negative meanings, much less the extremes in them!

This argument may be better worded as such: "Since man can identify good from bad, and can identify degrees of both, and since he identifies the rational necessity of a creator, and it is this sole creator who created man, his world around him and his reason within him, it follows then that every meaning that man views - by creation and natural reasoning – to be perfect, must be an attribute to that creator Himself, for He should not be surpassed in His attributes by any of His creatures! It was He who created them, and their ability to qualify things as good and bad! Absolute Perfectness and goodness is thus a place that only a single being should occupy: The creator of the system Himself"

At this point the atheist may object saying: "How do you know that He demands of us to view him to be good?" I would then say: What would you think of a creator who demands of His creatures to view him otherwise? He enables them to identify good from bad, makes them favor and revere every meaning that is good instinctively, and at the same time; hate and belittle every meaning that is bad instinctively, and yet reveal himself to them as an entity that they would only view as "bad"?! What would you think of such a creator? Well, obviously He would not be called wise and would not be

favored over his creatures! He would be doing them injustice if He ever commanded them to love Him or respect Him!

The atheist would then say: “But how do you know He commanded them to do that?” I would then say: “First of all, what exactly He did or did not command is a question of which book and which prophet is really His own, and that’s another issue. However, we can see that since we humans are naturally born the way we are and the world the way it is, and we think and feel the way we do; then it’s only rational that He created us as thus to place Him at the peak of all good feelings that we could humanly afford. For we cannot escape admitting the rational necessity that the creator of perfectness; be perfect Himself in every good meaning a created man can think of! The very fact that we are born with the capacity to think and feel this way, and to make this distinction between good and bad; proves this meaning.

The atheist may then raise the famous argument of what he views as imperfectness of creation, saying how then do you explain death, pain, venom, crime, wars, disease, etc.? And I must point out that it is right here that every debater other than a well informed Muslim, would collapse and fail to reply! Christian debaters always crash at this point, making weak statements that simply cry: “I do not know”! Well, Muslims **do** know, and without clear and precise heavenly knowledge of what exactly the world is all about and what we are here to do – which is a knowledge that can only be obtained from the creator Himself – there is no way any man could explain or understand on his own why such atrocities have to exist and take place within the system the way they do.

Actually, it is obvious that the system is made such that those events **should** take place! Earthquakes have to take place for the sake of the earth’s crust stability! Volcanoes alike! Thunderstorms and even hurricanes, all natural disasters have to take place so that nature would keep its balance! Death is essential for the birth of new life! What this clearly means is that those are NOT errors or imperfectness in the system! Those are parts of the way it is built! Essential parts indeed; polar elements! This system would simply fail without them acting as the opposite pole!

So to claim that they take place against the will of the creator is to say that He doesn't know what he's doing! Because it is clear that as consistently balanced and stable as the system is; those are by necessity fundamental components of its perfectness! Also to claim that they disprove the perfectness of His attributes is to take an extremely unjust position unrightfully judging the system and its creator! Because there is clearly a body of knowledge that is essential to acquire before doing this! You first have to obtain the knowledge – not the theory or the philosophy -that answers this particular question:

What is the **purpose** of this system, and why did the creator choose to make those atrocities fundamental components of the way nature works?

All reasonable men know that the success of any system is measured by how much it serves the purpose for which it was made! If I created a device that evidently fails to do what it was made for, then I have failed, and it is thus an imperfect device! But then, how should the user of this device measure and judge its success or failure? He must first know what exactly it is made for, and the way it works for that purpose! Because, if He thinks it was made for something other than what it was really made for, then how is he expected to make any fair or correct judgment of its performance or of the success or failure of its maker? He cannot! This is why he first has to refer to the maker, and read the manual of the device! He has to obtain knowledge of the purpose of creation of this perfectly balanced and masterfully maintained device before having any right to judge whether or not it is working well! Nobody said that you were born in this world to live in a paradise, and that since it is not a paradise; then the creator had failed in creating it! This is an argument from sheer ignorance!

The perfection of the system as it is – including the perfect way by which all catastrophes and mutilations are balanced and made to even be of benefit to the system itself in many ways – is undeniable; it only remains to be **known** why exactly it is made in this particular way! This knowledge is to be obtained from none but the creator Himself!

And this is where Scripture comes in the picture!

This is where we seek a knowledge that can only be delivered from the creator Himself to mankind to tell them what exactly this world was made for, and what they are here to do! Without this delivered knowledge, no man, no matter how wise, intelligent, or knowledgeable, could ever know the correct answer to these questions:

Who is the creator? What does He want of me? Why am I here, why should I die, and what will happen to me after death? Why is this world the way it is, and what am I supposed to do with it?

Such questions obviously CANNOT be answered by theorization or philosophy! Philosophers themselves do realize that! So what are they doing? Well, many of them have come to the point of thinking and questioning only for the fun of it! Posing questions just for whatever self-gratification it gives them, to know that at least they have the power to make a 'good' question, and make up whatever they wish to be its answer, and even enjoy having others follow them on those answers as though they were indeed the truth!

But are they?

Well, they simply don't know!

Man may keep thinking and contemplating for as long as he wishes, formulating as many theories as he can, fabricating all forms of hypothesis or legends, but he can never know the true answers on his own!

So it is here that revelation comes! The god-given knowledge! And at this point, reason poses the next rational question as such:

"Where is that revelation? Among those thousands of books that ascribe themselves to the creator; which one is the truth?"

Obviously this is a level that builds on the rational consensus that there has to be a creator! Now that we know there has to be a Lord, and that people claim to have received teachings from Him, we have no choice but to start inquiring for those teachings! The problem with an atheist is that every time you drive him to this point of the debate, he jumps back to the point of

"proving" the existence of the creator, all over again! He knows that this is the only rational result of accepting the concept of God! The next rational step! He has to search for the text that rightfully tells him what to do and how to live! And he simply hates that! He's too proud to accept somebody telling him what to do, even if it is his own maker!

We tell him to be honest as he looks around him and stop claiming that he doesn't see the truth in any of the world's religions, and hence claiming that it doesn't exist at all! But the sad reality is that most atheists are into atheism only because they HATE the very idea of submitting to scripture, any scripture! And a man with this inclination will never accept the truth no matter what anybody does!

And because they have no rational argument against God whatsoever; while we usually see them attempting poorly at different bodies of scripture from different religions trying to prove all religion wrong, we find them shifting back and forth repeatedly between this task and the task of attempting to disprove god altogether in the first place! This inconsistency of reason is understandable, because as much as their reason tells them that there is clearly no acceptable argument against the necessity of a creator, their pride blocks that meaning and drives them to keep arguing in arrogance! Every text of scripture that makes no sense to them is in their eyes evidence to disprove the existence of God altogether! Why? Because such is how they wish it to be!

Nobody said that all religions on earth are "correct"! This is impossible! Reason has it that only one of those many religions ascribed to the creator is the truth! Obviously no two religions share the same attributes of the creator, His deeds and what happens to man after death, not to mention the Lord's assignment to men in this world! And obviously there is fallacy and myth in written texts that carry the tag of religion all around the world that is enough to actually cover the face of the earth!

So you can rejoice in refuting as much scripture from as many false religions as you can, professor, this certainly doesn't give you any reasonable grounds

to make the conclusion that there is no “word of god” on this earth, not to mention refuting all religion and destroying the concept of God altogether!

This is nothing but *Wishful thinking*!

You do need to learn what the world was made for, before deciding on your judgment of its performance! So do not jump to the conclusion that since Christianity couldn’t offer you a satisfactory answer to this question; the question of why there has to be suffering in this world; then no other religion can! No, life was not made so that you could enjoy as much food and sex as you desire! And no it was not made so that you could spend it all browsing lazily on the beach! It was not made to be a paradise! And no, the Lord doesn’t love us all unconditionally, like evangelists would flatly say! Be honest with yourself and you will see where the truth has to be!

Now back to the argument of good and bad by Aquinas, the author states:

“*Humans can be both good and bad, so the maximum goodness cannot rest in us. “*

I say: Yes indeed; quite obviously so!

So what’s the problem professor? Do you claim otherwise? We certainly do not attribute “smelliness” to our creator, or any such clearly “bad” attribute, so where is your objection?

Dawkins then moves on to a fifth argument. I quote:

> *“The Teleological Argument, or Argument from Design. Things in the world, especially living things, look as though they have been designed. Nothing that we know looks designed unless it is designed. Therefore there must have been a designer, and we call him God.”*

It is amazing that the very first argument that moves the heart of every man and that is obviously on the top of it all, is put by the author here in number five! One cannot escape the urge to wonder, is this particular arrangement deliberate by the author? I do not know if such is how Thomas Aquinas originally wrote them, but I have to say that obviously no reasonable man would put this argument for the existence of the creator as number five!

So what does the professor say about this argument? He says it will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4 of his book! Well, I can't wait to get there!

However he doesn't forget to apply some spicing effects in attempt to fog off this argument, by speaking the magic word; the thread that every atheist seeks refuge for his faith in hanging by!: Darwin! It is really amazing how a man of "science" would apply such "cheap" tricks, thinking that broad claims like: "*Darwin has destroyed the argument from design*" would sell in the market of reason and scholarly argumentation! I say, a high priest of "the little JuJu at the bottom of the see" could do better, arguing for his faith!

He is trying to imply that since Darwin managed to offer a theoretical attempt to "explain" the advent of life by "natural selection" rather than the work of the creator, and since it has become mainstream "science", then it must be the truth, and there's no longer any reason to accept the argument that anything that appears to be "designed" is by necessity "designed"! This is really all that he has in his attempt to disprove the existence of a creator! A fundamentally flawed theory in terms of rational deduction; a theory that actually paints a purposeless, limited and imperfect planner (selector), responsible – by pure chance, in a "try and error" pattern - for the advent and the progress of life alone – not the rest of the universe - existing somewhere within the universe, under the tag of "nature"! Followers of Darwin are now trying to put that pathetic imagery in place of the perfect creator everywhere in the world, in the name of science! But have they managed to disprove the rational necessity of creation and purpose? Never!

The theory does not and cannot disprove creation (design) or the fact that the necessity of a perfectly consistent and inclusive predetermined course for the entire system to emerge and endure, is by all means rationally inevitable, as we will discuss thoroughly in another section! It builds on a fundamental linguistic and rational flaw as it is the case with all false faiths! It was no more than a pathetic attempt to say: "Well, why not suppose that life emerged by a huge multitude of acts of chance that just happened to deliver –given sufficient time - order from chaos, and perfectness from nothingness?"… Then, gradually the argument turned into: "Do not believe

your eyes, do not be fooled by your senses and the natural conclusion they lead you to; supreme design is a delusion, Darwin has *proved* it to be so!"

When you come to tell me not to believe my very own eyes, you have to present truly valid and substantial evidence to be granted acceptance of such a claim! Darwin and his followers never did that! His proposition simply came to their liking; so, evidence or no evidence, they're not letting go of it, no matter what!

It is amazing that many Darwinians would say: "If indeed the creator was good, why then would he create species in such a way that would appear as though they evolved from one another, and fool so many people into believing Darwin's theory is true?"

Simply put, I would say: What sickness of the mind would drive a man to make such a conclusion: "Since apes look pretty much like men, and we have seen many species emerge from genetic changes (mutations or whatever) and we can see species adapting (not "evolving") through successive generations with their locales; then men must have descended from apes in an evolutionary tree that goes all the way back to a unicellular organism in a lake where it all started, and hence we conclude that there is no creator at all"?

The fact that you have seen species ranging in morphological proximity from pretty much "looking like man", to not looking anything like him, coupled with the fact that within a certain species mutations take place and gradual changes may occur and new strands of a species may emerge; this does not give you any rational right to take that as proof for the claim that they all "descended" from a common ancestry, and without any willful creator! Darwin came out from the study of fossils and specimens of birds and mammals that he interbred, with the striking conclusion that all species descended from a single organism! What kind of a rational conclusion is this? If this is not pure fiction; I don't know what fiction is!

I do realize that adaptation and gradual changes of the genetic makeup of certain species for adaptive purposes is indeed a fact of science! But this is *not evolution*! We have indeed seen changes for better adaptation, but we

never saw “evolution”, in the sense of one species turning into another, or failing due to lack of sufficient organs and getting a random mutation “add” this organ to it by chance to save the species, or any of the scandalous details of the Darwinian myth of how all life forms emerged! By what right or reason does an honest scientist come out from those given facts that we actually observe, with the conclusion that all living species descended from a single source in a process that started by pure accident and continued to flow miraculously, one major act of chance after another through billions of years, without a creator / sustainer agent?

The story of the ancestry tree is no better a myth than the belief that some African god created all species by vomiting them on earth after a fit of stomach pain!

No the Lord did not create so many morphologically proximal species so that a sane self-respecting man would make such a corrupt conclusion, taking an ape for a grandfather and denying his creator altogether! He chose to create apes that look pretty much like men, and you chose – against all commonsense and natural reason - to believe that they shared ancestry with you! He’s certainly not to blame for that! Only those whose hearts have gone corrupt, would see evidence in this nonsense, and insist on accepting it against their very own minds and souls! This is part of the attribute of justice of the Lord almighty, may His names be praised!

Imagine if Darwin never wrote this Natural selection hypothesis, and instead, he thought of a totally different explanation for the origin of all species, one that could also explain the clear similarities in DNA structure among different species on earth; By what right or reason could you come to say: “If the creator did exist, then why would He fool us into thinking that life emerged on earth in this way?” Well, He didn’t! It’s you who held a fundamentally corrupt hypothesis so tight that you gradually turned it into an almost unquestionable fact, and even made it into a rational necessity that people should make those horrendous deductions whenever they look at the way natural life works, the way fossils look and on everything else that you call ‘evidence for evolution’! You chose this nonsense against everything that your mind and your natural human intuition tells you; so it is you who

deliberately challenged what God naturally created in your mind; it was not He who "fooled" you into thinking that He does not exist! So only you are to blame for your choices, and you will indeed stand accountant for them!

Arrogant deniers of the clear truth deserve to be fooled by what is actually a clear sign for His mastery of creation, His unity as a source of the craft of creation, and His richness in variability. In fact, any fare unbiased eye should see that the only way to explain this incredibly huge variety of species on earth, within the clear unity of the general structure, the general cellular properties, the unimaginably huge DNA database inherent in each cell, the reproductive tactics and general instincts, and so forth, is to say that this is nothing less than an act of **mastery of creation** intended for nothing by the creator but to demonstrate His mastery and unparalleled, and unimaginable supremacy, and to show man that the conditions of the planet that may have easily limited and hindered the creativity of any imperfect creator, did not limit or challenge Him at all, as He created this unimaginably huge and colorful palette of life forms, everywhere on earth, in the skies, in the sea, on the land, in the trees, underground, in your own body; and everywhere! They all demonstrate His unlimited powers; and His unity at the same time!

Atheists must understand that this IS indeed an explanation! In fact it is the ONLY explanation that justifies this dumbfounding magnificence and dazzling variety on all scales and at all levels, in living species everywhere on earth! It is the only explanation that gives it its rationally due credit! It is not an attempt to escape or to "put a god in the gaps" and stop searching! Escape from what exactly? From the attempt to complete a meaningless and baseless scientific myth that is unjustifiable, un-falsifiable, and that comes in conflict with healthy reason and common sense? A myth that not only poisons a man's mind, degrades his dreams and values, demises his purpose and ravishes his meaning altogether, but even does nothing to help him with his life the way natural science is supposed to do?! Escape from what exactly?

From the endorsement of a theory that does nothing more than make children at school BELIEVE that they were indeed descendants of those

fiction images in their science books, of the so called “hominid” ape ancestors, under the name of “science”? And based on what evidence? On the fragments of a lower jaw bone and a couple of teeth found in a cave here or there? Escape from what, really? What do you want to understand about the way life originated, and how do you really think you could grasp the way such a grand process must have taken place (regardless of how long it could’ve taken), and whatever you claim about it, how on earth do you expect to ever be capable of proving or validating it?

There is clearly no finding of observation that could be made evidence to prove anything at all about the way all those species came to exist in the far past, and coexist so harmonically throughout ages of life, and in such a perfect equilibrium! An Equilibrium that should – by the way – be a constant state of total balance on all stages of the history of life on earth, otherwise, the entire system would have crashed, long before that “historical moment” where Darwinians claim a fish to have successfully come out of the sea! A “mechanism” as blind as that of natural selection, how on earth does it account for the collective balance of the entire system, which is a rational necessity for the emergence of new generations of life all across those pretty long centuries? What internally blind force of “struggle” could ever have the rationally essential knowledge and power to balance life, death, reproduction rates, breeding rates, migration journeys, life cycle success, food chain perfect consistency with natural resources abundant, all along the history of life at every given instant, so the system would continue to progress this way throughout billions of years, generation to generation throughout, to end in this perfection? What evolution and what primates?

The very concept of primate evolution, from no order to orderly, and from crippled and incomplete to complete, is a rational fallacy at the very depth of what evolution really means! The initial conditions for the emergence of life to take place, not to mention any step to take place afterwards, even within their own myth, had to be perfectly prepared, otherwise, no change from one step to another would’ve ever taken place!

A primitive inefficient organism that is born imperfect, and that still needs to evolve as a species; means a failing system; one that lacks the standards and

conditions necessary for anything that could be called a species to ever come into being in the first place! And as such, a generation of inefficient mutated organisms should never have lasted long enough to even reproduce or continue to survive at all! The fact that we see adaptation taking place in generations of living organisms is indeed indicatory of a superior control agent that is capable of maintaining a strict balance between climatic and ecological changes on one hand, and the changing biological properties of those living beings throughout their successive generations on the other! An agent that is in complete unimpeded, uninterrupted awareness of every slight change that takes place in nature, and that keeps all universal laws running, thus authoring any genetic change that may be needed to keep a certain species in balance and adaptation, and to remain abundant on earth, or author any deliberately chosen cause that could, on the other hand, and within a perfectly preserved natural balance, make a certain species become extinct! But for a species to emerge incomplete or mutated or imperfect, and then "evolve" through time; this is simply impossible!

The only thing that is genuinely primitive indeed is the way those Darwinian Ape descendants think of the way life works!

Have they been any more intelligent than the average adult Orangutan, they would have seen the clear necessity of this ongoing equilibrium being the result of the ongoing work of an external agent in **control of the entire system of the Earth and the universe at large**, not mere **blind genes mutating by chance** from within the blind body cells of living species, with only the fit of them always getting the lucky chance to survive! They would have seen that if at any point this collective equilibrium was to fail – like the claimed theoretical hypotheses that caused dinosaurs to become extinct – no evolution or even new generations were to come to exist at all! Those species that – for example – had to suffer blindness before evolving an eye, would have never had what it takes to survive their place in the system, and would have never managed to even beget a following generation, no matter how many millions of years this is claimed to have taken! In fact, such a mythical miserable creature would not have survived more than a couple of generations as such! So a species should either come to life fully capable and

in its right place of the balanced system, with all necessary equipment for survival working effectively, or it could never even emerge as anything that could qualify as a species to begin with! A mutation that lacks survival necessities – like that poor fish "trying" to crawl out of the see – would never survive in the system long enough to keep reproducing and multiplying until the working mutation comes 'by chance'! You are literally talking about a "miracle" every time this is said to have happened!

So no, my respectable reader, the ape mentality behind Darwinism is certainly not "reason" and if anything at all; it's no less worthy of the tag "pseudoscience" than Astrology! So when they say this is by far "The best" explanation of the emergence of life that is known to man, and hence, it has to be true; they are only victims of their vanity, and the blind faith they have developed in this theory in defense of their atheism, a faith that is by no means any less powerful than the faith of a Hindu Guru in the seven "Chakras" or the elephant God (Ganesh)!

It is their vanity and arrogance that blinds them! Had they been humble, true and honest in their search for the truth, and truly willing to change their position if it proves to be wrong, and accept the responsibility that comes along with accepting the existence of the creator, they'd have easily seen the clear fallacy of their ways! They'd have at least taken towards Darwinism the same position every scientist takes towards any other theory! But there's a thick layer of prejudice and bias wrapping their hearts! It keeps showing us again and again, and pretty clearly, that Darwinism is not just a theory: It is indeed a religious doctrine disguised in a cape of science! Atheists and materialist philosophers of old could not dream of a better refuge for their faith than this illusion of science put forth by Darwin and his followers!

So no professor, sane searchers for the truth will not be intimidated by such a theatrical onslaught against reason and common sense! And dare you not insult the winged-horse, the dragon or the pink unicorn! For after all, with your methods of science and reasoning, I could easily hand you a fossil bone that actually proves them to be part of your ancestry!

On the Ontological argument!

In the next part professor Dawkins attacks the so-called "ontological argument" again on the assumption that by refuting the way its author wrote it, he may succeed in disproving the creator!

And again I say that he must understand that healthy-minded people have always seen the rational necessity of there being a creator, ever since the dawn of mankind, long before Aquinas or Anselm, or any other theologian or philosopher who may exercise some form of mental luxury that is certainly not required or needed by any sane man to "prove" the ultimately clear fact that he was created, and that he ought to be humble and show gratitude to his great creator!

So again I should make it clear, that no matter how many more arguments of philosophers the professor may yet put forth and attempt to come around and manipulate or even argue against; none of this is really what moves every sane man to recognize the power and grace of his maker ever since his mind starts working! None of it is what really moves every man regardless of his faith, even an atheist, when in imminent danger of drowning or dying to raise his face to the heavens and cry out for God! Those are not signs of blind faith or feebleness of the mind; those are natural components of every healthy mind, and it's only sheer arrogance to view them to be some form of a delusion!

And those arguments here, ontological, a priori, a posteriori, or whatever, are no more than some verbal attempts by philosophers to express their own ways of proving what is actually one of the clearest facts of reason ever known to man! A fact that really needs no proof!

So no matter how they are written, they are NOT how normal human beings know that their creator exists! And even though its already enough a waste of time that one would have to go through reading this attempt by the professor, we have no choice but to answer to it, lest some weak-minded reader may be tempted to find it of any value!

First, and before bringing forth the argument, the professor makes this comment… I quote:

> *An odd aspect of Anselm's argument is that it was originally addressed not to humans but to God himself, in the form of a prayer (you'd think that any entity capable of listening to a prayer would need no convincing of his own existence).*

(Dawkins, p. 80)

Well, whatever does this have to do with the validity of the argument's MEANING? The way this priest practices worship and prayer, he and whoever follows him on that, has nothing to do with the question in hand! That is, we can prove this man to be an innovator in choosing to use this or any other statement for a prayer to address the Lord with, however, this is not what we are examining here, is it? I can argue that not only the way this priest prays, but the way all Christians pray is indeed innovatory and relies on no reliable evidence at all that may prove that this is the way the Lord demands that He be worshipped! But is this what we're discussing here? Does this have anything to do with the rational validity of the argument itself?

Such comments by the author may indeed not be worthy of a comment, but I chose to make a commentary anyway because in the mind of a biased reader, one who is already biased against Christianity per se, or against religion altogether, such "noise" may indeed affect the way he makes his judgment and evaluation of what he reads! It's not a refuting argument yes, but the way it relates to the argument in question, "smokes" the mind of the reader even before the argument itself is presented! And to my mind, that's what it really is: Smoke!

Yes of course, we agree, no entity capable of listening to one's prayer "*needs*" any convincing of its own existence! But the question of whether or not He does **demand** that this particular argument be put in prayer to Him and that He be addressed with it is one thing and the examination of the validity of the argument itself is another! You'd think that as a reasonable man, the professor would realize this rational distinction! Well, he doesn't! And such is the case with this book (The God Delusion) and with every other literature ever written for the cause of atheism! Inconsistent arguments,

false results and conclusions, and a clearly arbitrary attack against everything that has anything to do with God!

They repeatedly hold the refutation of a certain religion, as evidence for the refutation of the existence of the creator Himself and the concept of religion altogether! On trying to refute the very concept of God itself, you find him jumping repeatedly on certain objections that he has (regardless of whether or not they are arguably right) on certain teachings, practices or rulings of certain religions in particular! You can easily see a desperate man trying to do anything to “gather” as many pieces as he can of what he wishes could qualify as a solid argument for his case; anything at all!

Well I say: they may gather as many false scriptures or corrupt rituals or prayers from as many false religions as they wish, and make fun of them from now to the end of time; this does NOT disprove the rational fact that there has to be a single creator that is worthy of all worship!

The author then says:

> *It is possible to conceive, Anselm said, of a being than which nothing greater can be conceived. Even an atheist can conceive of such a superlative being, though he would deny its existence in the real world…”*

Well, as a matter of fact, I have to argue that the so called “ontological argument” does NOT prove the existence of the creator, and it is wrong to think of it as such. It rather demonstrates that a reasonable mind **cannot dismiss** the idea of His existence.

I mean; to say that since I can conceive of God, then he exists, makes it – in this particular form – open for anything else that you can also conceive of, and yet does not by necessity exist in reality at all! And it is here that someone like Dr. Dawkins could say: well, why not say then that since I can conceive of a flying tee-pot orbiting around the earth, then it has to exist? This is the point! It doesn’t have to! And this is no proof!

The argument thus may better be written this way: **If I could NOT conceive of the creator (as the greatest entity in existence) then I could not say**

that He exists! This is sounder because as we demonstrated repeatedly in this literature, any meaning that is impossible to reason is impossible to exist in the outside world! A meaning like the trinity for example is the closest example to my mind right now! All those tricky nonsensical questions like (can God create another similar god?) or questions as such, fall under this category of meanings that are simply false and irrational altogether, and thus cannot be true!

Ergo, all that such an argument would really do is prove that the existence of the creator as almighty and perfect as He should be, does not in any way raise any rational objections whatsoever. Yes we CAN think of the existence of such an entity, and NO we have no rational reason whatsoever to reject this meaning! **We have every reason to conceive of His existence, and there's not – on the other hand - a single reason not to, neither in the mind, nor in the world as we see it!**

As a Muslim I never use such an argument to prove that the Lord exists! I do not say "since I can think of something that is greater than everything else, then that thing must exist, for it is too great not to, and thus the Lord exists"!

On further dissecting this meaning: "To exist is greater than not to exist": I say, the meaning as such is false, because I could also think of the dullest and the worst thing ever, and say that for it 'not to exist' is greater than otherwise! Does this mean then that it can't exist? Am I proving in this manner that such a thing does not exist? No!

So it turns out that we have to examine what exactly it is that we mean when we say "the greatest" or "greater", and on what givens we make that stand. This of course will, as it turns out, leave this argument meaningless as a "standalone" proof! We simply know that there has to be a perfect being because we can see all sorts of signs for that being's mastery everywhere, and the very fact that we exist, and that we do what we do, in addition to the essential meaningfulness and purposefulness that His existence puts in life, in death, and in everything else, makes it a must that this being be the perfect being, capable of all, limited by none! We do not say then, that only since we can think of it, then it must be there! We can think of many things

indeed, but whether or not they really **SHOULD** exist, is clearly irrelevant! The existence of the creator is simply a NECESSITY of reason; unlike anything else a man can think of!

I cannot overlook this interesting comment by the professor: "*Even an atheist can conceive of such a superlative being, though he would deny its existence in the real world"*

An entity than which nothing is greater, as such, is by necessity something that **does** exist, in reality not just in the mind! The "Chain of greatness" has to end at something than which nothing is greater! Even atheists – admits the professor - should recognize this meaning! So why would he deny its existence (whatever it is) in the real world? If we supposed that by "greatest" we are only talking about size – for example - then for the sake of the argument, that greatest thing ever, could be – according to an atheist's reasoning - a particular "star" or so, billions of light years away in the universe, for as far as the professor is concerned! So by what logic does he deny the existence of this "greatest entity of all" "in reality"? Or is it just because he doesn't like its being called a "being"?! In spite of all that reason necessitates, he would insist on the creator not being an extra-universal all-knowing being! And as I may come to demonstrate in another section, he does indeed believe in a 'god' that is witless and material (existing within the universe); even though he does not call it "god"!

Yes, we don't *prove* the existence of the creator by means of this argument, but he, on the other hand, must understand that he is not making any case for atheism merely by making fun of it!

In commentary on a quotation by Bertrand Russell, the professor says:

> *"My own feeling, to the contrary, would have been an automatic, deep suspicion of any line of reasoning that reached such a significant conclusion without feeding in a single piece of data from the real world."(Dawkins, p. 82)*

I would say; and that's exactly how every reasonable man should feel! We do not come to the conclusion that the creator exists "without feeding in a single piece of data from the real world"! On the absolute contrary I say: every single piece of data we get from the real world "**proves**" the creator! We do not use intuition alone, or the material world alone, to come to the natural conclusion that there has to be a creator, to which all perfectness should be ascribed!

This is exactly why we declare that the ontological argument is not at all sufficient and cannot be considered a standalone proof!

The professor then adds:

> *"Perhaps that indicates no more than that I am a scientist rather than a philosopher."*

Well then, professor, you leave me no choice but wonder: if your territory of expertise is only science and you are not a philosopher, then what on earth are you doing here? This is philosophy you are discussing in this chapter, isn't it? First order philosophy, and A-priori arguments of philosophers, theologians, logicians and scholars of religion, not scientists!

Okay, let me remind you that human knowledge relies on both: **Perception** and **Reasoning**! The attempt by some to split the two paradigms "science" and "philosophy/rational knowledge" apart is to me and to every self respecting man of science and wisdom: an absolute demise of all human knowledge!

The process of rationalization, theorization, setting up rules and guidelines of knowledge, deciding on purposes, objectives and definitions of different disciplines of human knowledge, such fundamental definitions that tell us what "Science" itself is, what it is for, which way it should go, and what methods of research are to be called "science" and what else other methods should be called, this is not in itself "science" but is generally called **philosophy of science**! It is not "science"!

However, there is a great bulk of fundamental works that conventionally carry the name “science”, when they are actually theories of philosophy! Which means that examining their rationale does not demand laboratory experimentation; rather it takes a brilliant man who understands what he reads, understands the logic applied in deduction and the mathematics derived from it, so he could judge the rational validity of such theories, and decide on whether or not they are to be called “science” at all! And the reason why every layman could easily criticize the Darwinian philosophy and ravish its rationale without needing to acquire any certificate in biology, is the fact that its rational foundations are too false to demand any certificate of science or philosophy at all! It’s really quite enough that it tries to synthesize an ongoing **process** (natural selection) from recurring events of **chance** (random mutation) that started all by chance, to end up with the claim that this mastery and perfection was **not created** at all! This is not a meaning that is too complicated to be refuted by a layperson!

It is natural that any theory of science should start by a “philosophical” assumption. But scientists have got to understand that if this basic philosophy underneath a given theory of science is rationally corrupt; not even a billion experiments or discoveries in the world could ever suffice to prove it! No piling up of ‘evidence’ could do any good to a theory of science that is rationally corrupt in its basic philosophical assumptions, because none of those findings that are claimed to “prove it” qualifies – rationally – to be called “evidence”! If we are to expect of an experiment or of any form of observation to validate a meaning that is rationally false by necessity of reason, then this would result in at least one of two conclusions: (a) Observation is delusion and cannot be trusted, or (b) Rational and linguistic necessities are not binding, and thus reason itself is unreliable! Thus we say: Observation *cannot* contradict with rational necessities, or be taken for evidence to prove logical fallacies, and any theory of science that relies on false reasoning should only be classified as (pseudoscience), no matter how popular or mainstream it may have become!

However, in the absence of heavenly wisdom, many such theories have indeed become mainstream science, in a scientific academia that is literally

infested with atheists! Those scientists have agreed to make them mainstream, and they believe that they are somehow progressing in proving them; but this doesn't make them the truth! You find that phenomenon showing in almost every field of natural sciences! A scientist cannot start his research without a general framework of convictions – stemming from his embraced view of nature and the world (basically his belief system!) - that effectively determines his goals and objectives!

Physicists once moved on the philosophy of Newton and Euclid, today they are streamed in their sciences by the philosophy of Einstein and Max Plank! Most biologists before Darwin stemmed from a certain view of life that differed radically from that adopted by their majority today! The question of whether or not this stream of theory – and the philosophical doctrine that hosts it - from which a scientist emerges, and within which he works, is evidently true and verifiable, is one that may indeed have nothing to do with empirical testing and laboratory findings!

Many times, debaters with Dawkins would argue with him that his Darwinism – according to his narrow view of human knowledge – is not an object for science to prove or disprove, but is rather a stance of philosophy, or a world view upon which he and all Darwinians construct their scientific objectives and– ultimately – their faith, one that could easily be criticized by every reasonable man! Yet he insists that *science* has proven Darwinism to be a "better theory than creation"! What science? The problem – as he ought to understand – is as deep as debating whether or not this proposition he holds so dearly about 'science' – as a branch of human knowledge - is reasonable or rationally valid to begin with!

What we choose to call design, he chooses to call natural selection! What we view to be perfectness and purposefulness, he chooses to view as dull randomness! What we claim to be explanatory knowledge that has to do with both this world and the world beyond, one that we hold to be verifiable knowledge, he readily claims to be pure myth and would choose to embrace a totally different explanatory thesis! It is obviously *not* a debate of science now, is it?

What an atheist fails to see is that, no longer for how many more centuries both parties may continue to research and pile up observatory knowledge, fossil findings, genetic discoveries and so forth, the dispute will never be resolved, because the difference between the two parties is not one that awaits an observatory evidence from the natural world to settle it down for good; it is a rational debate that has to do with the "philosophical" - or rather: logical - foundations of thought and of "scientific deduction" upon which the two schools stand!

They must understand that the problem is not with the tuning up or the calibration of the machines in their labs! The problem is far more fundamental than they think! It is one that has to be dealt with before the decision to go into the lab!

This is why Dawkins along with almost all atheists of our time are clearly confused between the two paradigms of human knowledge: the so called science, and the so called philosophy! They (wishfully) think that science proves their philosophical nonsense, when in fact it doesn't! A claim that is self evidently irrational cannot be proved (or disproved) by the scientific method. This is as far as any reasonable man may need to go in arguing with Darwinians! And the reason why I chose to examine the Darwinian thesis in some detail in this literature is not because I think this is where the problem is; the problem is deep at the very bottom of its major tenets! I did this (as yet to come) only to further demonstrate how rationally incoherent, inconsistent and self-contradictory the Darwinian myth really is, and to prove to the reader that had this fundamentally corrupt and incoherent theory been any other theory in any other discipline of science, with no bearing on the question of creation; it wouldn't have even made it through to this century without being effectively dismissed by every honest scientist, and taken for an example of what bad philosophy could do to natural science! Yet instead, it was taken for the foundation of modern biology!

Dawkins says, in many occasions, that he believes the subject matter here (dealing with God) is one that has everything to do with science, because he thinks that science seeks to answer those very same questions that "religion" is answering, only religion, he says, answers them wrong!

Well, who says that "religion" is wrong and "science" is right, in dealing with those particular questions? And how many more fossils do they still need to unearth to finally understand that neither Darwinism, nor any other opposing view can be proved or disproved as answer to this question by this so called "evidence"?

If by science he means direct observation and mere empirical research, then he's clearly not talking science in this book, for the most part! And if by this thin and narrow-minded view, he defines science, then he is really suffocating himself, and it is as though he's shouting out loud: "Watch me! I'm standing at some place where – as a scientist – I'm not supposed to be"! This is why many philosophers do indeed find this position the professor has gotten himself into; an act of intellectual suicide!

I'm afraid the professor obviously doesn't know under what discipline of human knowledge this debate he is into really falls, and why!

If by a man of science, again, he means that his craft is taking observations and attempting to offer explanatory theories for them, then certainly this has everything to do with religion and with what philosophers do! Because if it is a rationally corrupt philosophy or religion that he stands upon, and from which his propositions emerge; then he is simply claiming fallacy, no matter what he calls it, and no matter what results he gets in his lab! This is simply because the lab, its experiments and their results, would then all come from previous convictions that are themselves rationally flawed!

If I believe, in advance, that for example finding traces of "water" on a certain planet, would stand as sound evidence for the existence of – or the mere possibility of - "natural life" there, then every process of research that I may build upon this view, and every process of "science" I may apply in search for that water, takes by necessity the very same judgment or criticism that this view itself should take! And the essential question here would then be: If I did find traces of water there, would this *prove* that there was or is or could ever be any form of natural life on that planet? Only a scientist driven by his academic ambitions and drenched in his personal belief in Darwinian evolution would argue that it does! But in fact it doesn't! Why? Because

science or no science, the very idea that life could emerge by accident from dead matter in a "primordial lake" is fundamentally false!

The philosophical question of whether or not it is necessary that everywhere in the universe we find water, we can expect to find life, is one that goes down to the roots of Darwinism, and the "myth" of the so called "primordial lake"! No matter how much "science" followers of this myth would do, they will never manage – by means of science – to prove or disprove it! They have to sit back, break free from the chain they are so rigidly bound to, close the lab for a while, and start searching somewhere else! Because it is only reasonable that if your fundamental claim itself is rationally valid and worthwhile, then so is every tool of science that seeks to serve it by experimentation, simulation and discovery! But if not, not!

And again I say this is why it is fairly easy for any reasonable educated well-read man to refute Darwinism without having to hold a PHD in microbiology, archeology, or paleontology! And it is exactly why – on the other hand - the professor here is thrusting his head boldly within what is viewed to be the territory of philosophers and theologians, without feeling that he needs to carry any particular credentials in philosophy or in theology to do so! It's a very basic level of human reasoning that we're discussing here! Much of it really has to do with this rational "common sense" that the professor so easily undermines, and describes as "misleading"! [8]

[8] By the way: I'm sorry to disappoint him, but it is by this very simple common sense itself that we can easily prove the Zeno paradox about Achilles and the tortoise to be nothing but nonsense! Obviously, all that "Achilles" has to do to catch up with the tortoise is to keep running until he does! Reasonable people did not have to wait until a theory of advanced mathematics comes along in modern times to help them understand this! And of course – most essentially – they did not doubt for a minute, because of that childish paradox, that Achilles would easily catch up with the tortoise! Yes they probably had to wait until a certain form of mathematics was developed to properly model and simulate this particular mathematical question here; but the fact remains; the paradox comes only from the way its conclusion is written! The conclusion that "he will never reach the tortoise" is clearly bogus! He will, clearly, keep running until the difference dissolves to zero, and there he will reach it! So I'm amazed at the professor's attempt to use such games to cover the face of the sun! You'd refuse the existence of a creator and wait until somebody proves to you, mathematically, something like the fact that Achilles has to be able to catch up with the tortoise? What a pity! But this is what Darwinism does to people's minds!

So, as we proceed with this literature, more of the rational distortion and fundamental corruption of reason upon which Dawkins founds his views and conclusions, and naturally his "science", will be exposed.

Now I'd like to highlight this statement in particular by the professor:

> *"I mean it as a compliment when I say that you could almost define a philosopher as someone who won't take common sense for an answer."(Dawkins, p.83)*

I have to note here that just as long he does not make a clear definition of what he calls "common sense" we cannot choose to agree or disagree with this statement! For, if by common sense he means blind faith, and inherited norms that have never acquired inspection or arguing against in his community, then yes, by never taking *that* for an answer, it is a compliment for any reasonable man! But if by common sense he means those very basic axioms of reason that do not even demand to be proven in the eyes of any healthy mind to begin with; then this is certainly not a compliment! I'm not to be called wise, or even sane, if I wrote a complete volume in attempt to prove that I exist, or that the world exists, am I?!

With indefinite and unparticular statements as such, the professor manages to create an atmosphere that leaves an uninformed reader compelled to think of his arguments as reasonable and worthwhile, when obviously they are not!

Now, still on the mission of debunking the ontological argument, the professor puts forth an argument by Douglass Gasking, which supposedly disproves god.

I quote:

> *"1 The creation of the world is the most marvelous achievement imaginable.*
> *2 The merit of an achievement is the product of (a) its intrinsic quality, and (b) the ability of its creator.*

3 The greater the disability (or handicap) of the creator, the more impressive the achievement.
4 The most formidable handicap for a creator would be nonexistence.
5 Therefore if we suppose that the universe is the product of an existent creator we can conceive a greater being - namely, one who created everything while not existing.
6 An existing God therefore would not be a being greater than which a greater cannot be conceived because an even more formidable
and incredible creator would be a God which did not exist.
Ergo:
7 God does not exist." (Dawkins, p.83)

Now even though the professor does – thankfully – admit that this argument doesn't work at all in disproving God, I find myself compelled to explain the precise reason why it doesn't, and why it has nothing to do with the question in hand. After all, if he thinks it's fun to bring it forth, then perhaps it's even more fun to destroy it. I hope he finds himself "entertained" as he reads this (if he ever does)!

Premise (1): true!

Premise (2): Absolutely true!

Premise (3): Now here comes the trick! "*more impressive*"! Reason denies the creator of the universe being in any way limited by what man is limited by! Why? Look around you at the way the universe is running and hopefully you'll see! Try to contemplate in the meaning that the creator of a system is by necessity not bound to the restrictions and boundaries he created in it, and you will see! He has to be far beyond universal limitations of any sort! And since "disability" or "handicap" is only a form of limitation that He created in this world (the purpose of which is not our topic here!), then it should follow that He be not attributed to any form of disability! This goes down to the rational argument of omnipotence and its essential meaning!

So no it's not "more impressive" that this universe be the work of a handicap, because it's already evidently impossible that it be in any way the work of even a super human!

Ergo, the entire argument collapses!

However, to further amuse the professor, I would like to add that on premise (4), the conclusion is clearly false as well! No the most formidable of handicap is not non-existence! Non-existence is nothingness, not an attribute to be impressed by! A totally paralyzed and incapable being is one thing, and a non-being is an entirely different issue! Yes a totally powerless being is as good as none at all (in terms of physical ability), but rationally, the two issues are not one and the same! And to prove the existence of a totally incapable being is not equal to proving a being's non-existence!

The professor then proceeds with sheer humor, to make fun of a number of "Comic" attempts written precisely to make fun of those who see the divine beyond every order in life, but may fail in expressing it in words. He quotes Huxley's mockery of a man who concludes that since infinity multiplied by naught equals any positive real number, then God is infinite creating existence from nothingness! Well this is no argument of course, no question! However, it doesn't mean that the very fact that you *can* do mathematics can't – in itself - be part of what proves the creator's existence to every reasonable man! But what is "a reasonable man"?

As I hope my reader will eventually conclude on his own after reading this literature: Atheists are not at all in good terms with basic human reason! Not that an atheist cannot do mathematics, practice natural sciences and research, or prove to have a significantly high IQ or earn a Nobel Prize, but because the magnitude of rational errors and fallacies upon which he founds his entire being and his entire process of knowledge and reasoning, and – sadly so – would attempt to prove and even battle for; is really outstandingly monumental! It's a real pity!

They are not at all stupid! In fact a majority of particularly smart scientists in the west are admittedly atheists! However, it's not that they can't do science, and excel at it; it's this false "faith" they choose to embrace that really

makes them – in terms of rationality - no better than those poor Indians dancing around a Wooden statue asking it for rain!

The professor brings forth such quotations as though it is only by means of such 'mumbo jumbo' that sane people "prove" the existence of the creator! We do admit the ontological argument to be inadequate and insufficient! In fact, if I wished, I could quote a number of theologians and scholars from different faiths, theistic and even polytheistic that actually proved it inefficient and rephrased it in different ways! So what?! It's not making your case any good, professor, to go to some comic website and quote a number of jokes by atheists making fun of it!

This *does not* by any means prove your case!

Here's some of those jokes, I quote:

> *"36 Argument from Incomplete Devastation: A plane crashed killing 143 passengers and crew. But one child survived with only third-degree burns. Therefore God exists.*
> *37 Argument from Possible Worlds: If things had been different, then things would be different. That would be bad. Therefore God exists.*
> *38 Argument from Sheer Will: I do believe in God! I do believe in God! I do I do I do. I do believe in God! Therefore God exists.*
> *39 Argument from Non-belief: The majority of the world's population are non-believers in Christianity. This is just what Satan intended. Therefore God exists.*
> *40 Argument from Post-Death Experience: Person X died an atheist. He now realizes his mistake. Therefore God exists.*
> *41 Argument from Emotional Blackmail: God loves you. How could you be so heartless as not to believe in him? Therefore God exists." (Dawkins, p.85)*

Okay then, although this is not how a wise man should approach an issue as dangerous and serious as this, it wouldn't hurt to show the professor that we *do* have a sense of humor too!

So how about a few “funny” atheist arguments against the existence of the creator?

1 – Argument from spaghetti: Since there is no such a thing as the spaghetti monster, therefore there is no such a thing as “god” either!

2 – Argument from natural selection: Since someone finally managed to come up with an ‘elegant’ natural explanation, then it is nature that runs the whole thing, and there is probably no such a thing as God!

3 – Argument from world criminals: Since a great deal of world criminals belong to religion, and many of them do horrendous crimes in the name of religion; therefore all religions are nonsense; ergo there is no God!

4 – Argument from Rotten remains: Since we have found many fossils of teeth and bones that look as though they come from an ape-like man, or a man-like ape, a fish-like reptile, or a reptile-like bird, therefore Darwin was right, Chimpanzees are our cousins, and there is no God!

5 – Argument from genetic change: Since genes do change on the course of generations, therefore they have been evolving themselves starting from a lake of proteins, controlling every living thing for their own survival; no place for a “god” there!

6 – Argument from empirical observation: Since nobody has ever seen “God” in the telescope, anywhere over the moon or around the solar system, therefore He does not exist!

7 - Argument from inheritance: Since all religions teach little kids to follow their faith from early childhood ‘as though’ it were the truth, therefore all religions are false and “abusive”, and – or course - there is no God!

8 – Argument from particular false religions: Since it cannot be that God is both one and three, therefore there is no God at all!

9 – Argument from improbability: Since I think it is very improbable that the world was *created*, therefore there is no God!

10 – Argument from Sheer ignorance: I do not know why there has to be suffering in the world! Since there are those many things that I hate in the world and do not understand, therefore there can't be a creator! …..

Shall I continue?

Well I suppose any reasonable reader can see now that although the "Jokes" the professor puts forth to make fun of arguments for creation, are indeed too feeble to even consider, this list of "jokes" I just wrote as example of atheist arguments "against" the creator are really not jokes at all! Those *are* indeed the kinds of arguments atheists use to convince themselves that there is no reason whatsoever to suppose that there is a creator!

On "The Argument from Beauty"

The author then delves into what he calls the argument from beauty.

He starts off his battle sarcastically as usual, talking about how he chose a disc of 'religious music' by "Bach" to listen to on some radio show although he is an anti-religious man! He also draws in the point that Raphael and Michelangelo would have not been any less talented, had they been atheists, and brilliantly he states that had Christianity not been the prevailing faith in their time, who knows what else they might have painted?

The moral? The existence of the creator – or basically: belief therein - has "nothing" to do with man's ability to enjoy "beautiful" things!

Well, there are two separate issues here that cannot be addressed as one!

1 - The position that **the *existence*** of the creator is irrelevant to enjoying beauty,

2 - The position that ***faith*** in the creator is irrelevant to enjoying beauty.

Yes, one's faith or religion may have nothing to do with his ability to create "Art" or to enjoy beauty, in the sense that all humans are generally capable of enjoying beauty, regardless of their faith.

However, it is evident that those who believe in a supreme creator who deserves gratitude for this beauty, and whose attributes fully justify this beauty, and have faith in a next-life of even a far more glorious and beautiful nature than this one, are much happier and much more self satisfied and contented by experiencing beauty, - at the very least rejoicing in the hope that death will not take this beauty away from them - hence enjoy it far more immensely on a spiritual level than those who merely see molecules and chemical reactions underneath!

In many occasions atheists may complain that it means nothing to say that everything has to have a meaning because it doesn't! Well they're wrong! Because this is not some functionless or purposeless property in human reason; the ability and the need to obtain convenient meanings and purposes for every phenomenon in this life, not to mention answers to the big questions of existence that really define who we are and why we are here! They cannot explain it! It is not a sickness that could be cured by simply making up any myth and placing it there! It is not a disease that will be cured by furthering knowledge of science and of nature or "raising one's consciousness"! It's the way human reason works, the way we humans make sense of things! The fact that Darwinism leaves its adherents empty or desensitized in those areas, does not render them redundant!

The problem with atheists is that they claim they do not need any external source to guide them to those basic answers! They'd rather spend their entire lifetimes searching in vain, in all the wrong places, than search in any book that claims to have this wisdom sealed by prophet-hood from the creator Himself! So the question of meaning to them holds no "meaning" or significance at all! But that's not how healthy humans are! That's the outcome of a miserable mind and heart that had been mutilated by Darwinian nonsense!

Beauty, whether they do realize this fact or not, with meaning and purpose is far more "beautiful" and "enjoyable" than this grim materialistic blankness with no end or transcendental value whatsoever! Such is how man is made! He *needs* to conceive of meanings that correspond to those things that impact him deeply, maybe even more than he needs to eat or drink; even an

atheist cannot escape this natural need! This property in man is not a psychological defect or an evolutionary tactic developed in him for the sake of a miserable ‘struggle for existence’, it’s a self-evident necessity, proprietary of the way humans think!

Am I claiming this mere fact – in itself - to prove that there has to be a creator? No! (Although any sane man should view it to point to no other direction!) I’m only making the point that the approach adopted by the author here, in attempt to dissect those endless things that drive – in their totality - every reasonable man to conceive of a perfect creator, is not doing him any good on his cause to disprove that creator!

On the other hand, to claim that the existence of the creator is also irrelevant to the issue of beauty (both in the existence of beauty and in the human ability to enjoy it) this is so far away from the truth! The concept of beauty in itself is not one that should be approached by means of mathematical equations and numbers! It cannot be “gauged” or “weighed” or assigned a physical dimension to measure it! It is the sensual impact of the perception of certain physical objects or events on the human spirit (or state of the mind). Sick people cannot see beauty in a beautiful rose not because the rose is not in itself beautiful, but because the mechanism within them that enables them to “feel” and “enjoy” its beauty is malfunctioning.

The question now is, in a world perceived by a Darwinian who believes that everything exists for the material struggle of genes to survive, and that there is no such thing as a “spiritual dimension” to human life, where exactly does the ability to enjoy beauty stand in the “evolutionary ladder”? How can an evolutionist explain “why” it ever came into being in the human psyche? Well, he can’t! We certainly don’t need to enjoy beauty in order to multiply for the sake of our genes to survive, do we? He may answer saying: Of course we do, because without enjoying beauty we would be depressed and would malfunction, hence fail to reproduce! I would say: “But the question remains; why is it that without enjoying beauty we would be depressed? I mean, you still cannot explain the phenomenon itself, why is it that humans – apart from all other species that walk the Earth, have to feel happy and satisfied – one way or another – and keep searching for this contentment, in

order not to go sick and eventually commit suicide? Why do we never see an ape – for example - committing suicide?!

We actually do not need – in the light of the Darwinian world-view - to be any more “advanced” in any aspect of our existence on this earth, than apes or pigs for that matter! So why are we so advanced, while they are not? They would only have “chance” to resort to! It is only by chance that this mutation came to be, they would say, even against what natural selection should be doing!

Dawkins I suppose would say: “well, I may not have a place for the ability to enjoy beauty in the evolutionary ladder, with respect to your argument, but maybe somebody will tomorrow, and this certainly does not make it proof for the existence of a creator!”

And then I would say: “Again, it is not the theist who is in the position where he needs to “**prove**” why he believes there has to be a perfect supreme creator for a perfectly magnificent “and ultimately beautiful” system; it is the atheist who carries the unbearable burden of proving otherwise! It is he who has to offer clear acceptable reasons why he defies this natural flawless reasoning and believes otherwise! You cannot prove the obvious by doing anything more than demand the denier to just **open his eyes!**

On the Argument from Personal Experience

I do not have to reconfirm the fact that the earth is so full of false religions, and people who are fooled by following blindly – regardless of excuse or lack thereof - the faith of their fathers and their communities, into assuming that their false religion is true, and is self-evident!

So if the professor rejoices in mocking and ridiculing false beliefs of false doctrines, I have to say that we all share the same sentiment with him! The only difference is that we know where the truth is; while he insists on denying it!

Whoever makes any fallacious claims about a “relationship” with the creator that makes him believe in a personal God, is just another follower of myth and fallacy!

However, my question to the professor is this: By what evidence does *he* hold that it is – for example – impossible for a man to get spoken to by the creator? I mean, accepting the least possibility of the existence of a creator, if then somebody comes to claim that the creator did indeed talk to him, how does he, the professor, prove him to be a liar?

He would probably say: it is easy to assume that he or she is delusional or suffers from hallucinations of some sort, imagining things that are not there! Well, yes of course it is possible, and dead easy! But it is equally possible and even easier to claim that he is indeed in contact with a supernatural being of some sort – whether or not it is indeed the creator is another question! Isn’t it?

At this point the atheist would resort to probability, saying, what are the odds that it really is a supernatural being? I would say even if the odds are one to ten billion! Isn’t it possible?

That man claiming to be spoken to by God could he or could he not be that one in a ten billion? It is amazing how atheists would apply probability as though it disproves their opponents’ claims, when in fact it does not! The claim that it is highly unlikely that this be the case – regardless of where exactly this position itself comes from and what evidence substantiates it – does NOT deny the possibility that it is indeed the case! So how do you know?

They don’t!

Well I say there is indeed a bulk of knowledge that comes from the creator Himself, evidently so, that tells us what this “being” encountered by those poor people really is, - if it is in many cases not some form of hallucination, which is certainly a possibility that we do recognize - and how to protect oneself against it. Like I said earlier, having stood at the point where we see the necessity of a creator, the next logical step is to start examining doctrines

of knowledge that are ascribed to Him![9] And on accepting the true religion to be indeed His word, and His given knowledge to mankind, in that knowledge we will find the only reliable teachings that tell us what exactly it is that's going on with those people, and whether or not they are delusional!

However, the point is that so long as the atheist continues to deny the existence of the creator altogether, or admits Him, but refuses to examine religions that are claimed to be His teaching, in search for knowledge that he lacks about Him, never will he manage to tell for certain what the truth is in those cases of people claiming to have spoken to God or to angels or to dead people or so forth! And his position there will never be one of evident verifiable knowledge, but rather one of speculation and probabilistic assumptions! He "feels" like considering those people to be delusional, so such is how he chooses to judge them! … Their evidence? Well, he'd say: "They are more likely to be so than not"! That's all he has, nothing more!

I now ask every reasonable reader; is this by any standard of reason to be called *knowledge*? And more essentially; are those claims by those people to be used against the argument of the existence of the creator Himself?

This is the point! You can't use them to disprove the creator! Just because you don't feel "comfortable" thinking of a creator who can listen to your innermost thoughts despite your will, doesn't make it "unlikely" or "improbable" that He CAN! I mean how *probable* is it – applying your own conception of probability - , really, that all this perfectness of order that you see in the universe around you and in your own body, just happened to come about eventually through a gradual accumulation of unplanned events of chance? Is it any less probable that those guys really did see something that is supernatural (regardless of what it really is)? And even if it is less probable, by what reason do you take it to mean that they are delusional, much less disprove the existence of the supernatural?

---

[9] How we make that proof is not our point here, and as you proceed reading this literature, my reader, you will realize that the question of what religion on this earth is the truth, is not in need for any proof at all!

Atheists clearly have nothing to stand upon here! Nothing at all! And they never will! In denial of the perfectly clear truth, nothing could possibly qualify for proof!

They rely on wishful thinking just as much as those deluded poor fellows who may think they have seen Jesus or Mary or some dead saint talking to them in the Church! I do have evident knowledge that neither Jesus nor Mary nor Muhammad nor any dead man for that matter could appear to any living man, much less teach him to further revere that dead person or do more "Rosaries" or tell him about the future or heal him or so forth! Is this only because I'm not a Christian? No! It is because I claim that the knowledge I have in Islam in this respect is evidently the truth. However, since Dawkins is only trying to ridicule the entire concept of people witnessing supernatural sightings or revelations, for the sake of disproving the divine, I will suffice for now in taking the position of proving him lacking of any form of evidence to back up his arrogant attitude! And I think that by far, I have made this point quite clearly!

Just watch how ascertained Sam Harris sounds in the quotation that Dawkins cites here from his book "The end of faith":

> *"And so, while religious people are not generally mad, their core beliefs absolutely are. …"*

Absolutely? What a magnanimous statement!

Excuse me Mr. Harris, I'm sorry to disappoint you, but not only are you ignorant, you are extremely arrogant at that!

With the drag of a pencil, this man made it a position of *certainty* that **all** "Religious people" suffer from beliefs that are '*mad*' in the '*core*'! Why? Because he finds the idea of a being that is capable of listening to his innermost thoughts, as 'mad' as any claim made by any mentally sick fellow in a mental health institution, even though he knows it is clearly not impossible in concept, that there actually be such an entity with such ability, and that it is in fact a rationally necessary ability in the being that created us! However, he's too proud to even give the concept – at the very least - the

benefit of a doubt! Denial is much easier indeed, isn't it? Lack of courtesy and disrespect to everything that spells "religion" is far more self-gratifying than otherwise, isn't it?

It's noteworthy that while an atheist dares not make such a blind general conclusion regarding certain branches of knowledge he knows little about, he easily dares to put all forms of religious knowledge in one basket and call it "*mad* in the core"!

I hope I need not say much more to show my respectable reader how arrogant and extremely off-limits, such a blind statement is, by all measures of rational integrity and self-respect!

The professor then goes in an interesting – really interesting - explanation of some optical illusion that is seen in a hollow mask that he hangs on his windowsill! He makes the point that the mind works in extremely sophisticated ways, and comes to this conclusion:

> *"To simulate a ghost or an angel or a Virgin Mary would be child's play to software of this sophistication."*

I say yes indeed you're right! I – for myself, as a Muslim – do not by any means deny the possibility that a great deal of those "apparitions" or "sightings" is actually nothing more than this! So how does this disprove the supernatural altogether? Shouldn't we ask them to offer their evidence? and more essentially: what evidence does any of this raise against the **existence of the creator**?

> He states: "*Such visions and manifestations are certainly not good grounds for believing that ghosts or angels, gods or virgins, are actually there." (Dawkins, p. 91)*

And I say; yes indeed they're not! And whoever takes them for evidence is indeed ignorant, feeble-minded, and deserves to be fooled!

I may even mention that unfortunately many ignorant Muslims are often impressed by such constructs of the brain when they see – for example - a cloud that reads something like the Arabic word (ALLAH) or something of

the sort, and they sometimes call it a miracle! It's a psychological phenomenon of perception known as (*Pareidolia*) where people tend to see meanings in images intended for no such meanings! And while a Muslim may view such an image as an extraordinary sign with the name of "Allah", people from other faiths will hardly see it the way he sees it! So from a sound scholarly position; such "sightings" qualify as nothing in Islam! And although they may do good work in the hearts of some Muslims and strengthen their passion for faith, they certainly have nothing to do with **miracles** or with the correct Muslim knowledge of what miracles are, and they are not at all to be encouraged or to be taken seriously!

The professor then comes to a very slippery place when he tries to claim that in mass sightings, thousands of people could somehow share a *common* hallucination, or an experience of "mirage" or so! He says:

> *"On the face of it mass visions, such as the report that seventy thousand pilgrims at Fatima in Portugal in 1917 saw the sun 'tear itself from the heavens and come crashing down upon the multitude',49 are harder to write off. It is not easy to explain how seventy thousand people could share the same hallucination. But it is even harder to accept that it really happened without the rest of the world, outside Fatima, seeing it too - and not just seeing it, but feeling it as the catastrophic destruction of the solar system, including acceleration forces sufficient to hurl everybody into space." (Dawkins, p. 91)*

Well, first of all, one has to point out that when seventy thousand people are reported to have all seen **something**, then you CANNOT dismiss that claim! And this – by the way – is a form of reliable evidence in granting approval of narrations and stories of historical events. We accept a story from any source either because we have no doubt in the honesty and truthfulness of its narrator, or because we receive it from a huge number of sources, the quantity of which makes it *impossible* that they would deliberately lie or conspire to manipulate the story.

And when you think about it, actually a great deal of what every one of us knows about the world today comes from documented sources that tell us

"stories" about it! I never saw – for instance – the Sydney opera house with my own two eyes! Had I not been told about it – in concept – by a source that I trust, I may have never known it existed! Well of course the media, and the way documentation of knowledge has advanced, made it much easier to access knowledge of certain events, stories, discoveries and so forth, everywhere in the world! But the concept itself remains true, that as a human, you cannot escape the dire need to obtain knowledge from direct narration from a source that you trust! I would say that at least 90% of the sum of everything you know, my reader, came to you through other sources than direct perception and experience.

So in fact, when we speak of evidence for the occurrence of a certain historical event – which is naturally a crucial necessity for identifying truth from fallacy regarding claims about prophets of God, and examining the authenticity of scripture – we are ultimately examining **the way** the news reached us!

When somebody comes to tell me: "didn't you know? One of your friends has had a stroke and is now in the hospital!" I'd either trust this man and take it for granted and start acting upon it, or I would say in suspicion – for reasons that should be examined – "Who told you so?" Or "How do you know?" Naturally if he is likely to lie to me, I should not believe him, I have to confirm the news beforehand!

Now suppose I'm walking in the street and every passerby that I know keeps telling me: "Hurry up, there's a friend waiting for you in your place!" … would I feel the same way about this piece of information, if only one man that I may not really trust, told me this news? Of course not! And, naturally, the bigger the number of generally trustworthy sources, the much less likely they are to be all telling a lie, or to have all miss-perceived the event!

I bring this up here to make it clear that in cases of Mass visions, when so many people say they all saw something then they MUST have seen something! There is no room for the claim that the entire story of Fatima (for example) could be forged by some historian, and that it never happened that so many people witnessed the event, because the proclaimed event was not

that far away back in the past, and people still have their parents, grandparents and people they trust telling them that they did witness the event themselves! The continuous sources of the narrative are still plentiful, and the chain was never broken!

Now, it is of course needless to say that the event they witnessed that day was not and cannot have been **the actual drop down of the sun**, for obvious reasons that are discussed fairly well by the professor! But then, what was it? What did they really see? It must have been something extra-ordinary perhaps even *supernatural* that appeared to them **as though** the sun had fallen from its place; not just a “mirage”!

Well, I really couldn’t care less what it was that they actually saw that day, because what they – as Christians – claim it to be, is evidently false under the knowledge of Islam. However, my intent is to point out that although the professor may find it inevitable to admit that they must have seen *something*, he would insist on readily overruling the possibility that it be anything *supernatural*, only because he hates to admit that there could be anything supernatural at all! Yes I agree that it was not what they thought it was – I know it wasn’t; but it could still be a supernatural sighting nonetheless; and it most probably was! The knowledge that I take from Islam is the only way for a man to understand how they could all be telling the truth when they claim that they – for example – saw the image of Mary talking to them! An atheist – on the other hand – will have no choice but to deny it entirely, or propose some “science fiction” explanation that really only qualifies as “*supernatural*”! He’d say it could be a time traveler with holographic technologies, an alien from an advanced civilization toying with us, or perhaps the quantum interference between our universe and a parallel universe… etc.) But to claim that there is a species of invisible intelligent beings that live on this Earth amongst us, those we call (Jinn) or (demons), and they have always enjoyed the ability to play such games; that’s readily a ludicrous superstition! No further questions!

Anyway, to get out of all this, I leave you, my reader, with this open question: **In what way does any of this “disprove” the existence of the creator?** And what is it that the professor has really done in this part against

what he calls the argument from personal experience: visions, sightings and so forth? This is the conclusion he comes up with:

> *"That is really all that needs to be said about personal 'experiences' of gods or other religious phenomena. If you've had such an experience, you may well find yourself believing firmly that it was real. But don't expect the rest of us to take your word for it, especially if we have the slightest familiarity with the brain and its powerful workings."*

In a word, he means to say: You people may have really seen something significant indeed; but I do not find any reason to believe you, or to think of whatever it is that you saw as anything more than hallucination!

On the Argument from scripture!

Well, this is, perhaps, the part where it shows – in the full and to the utmost clarity – that the professor is seriously ignorant in the knowledge of religion; the very thing he is waging his war against! You'd think that as a "scholarly" man who has eventually come to the conclusion that there's not a single volume of scripture anywhere in the world that is worth taking seriously, the professor would examine in this part – at least – all major bodies of scripture venerated by their followers and are ascribed one way or another to the Lord! (i.e.: The bible, the Talmud, the Quran, the books of Sunnah, the Avista, the Vedas, … etc.). After all the conclusion he reaches at the end of this part is clearly that whoever finds any reason to think of his book of scripture – any holy book at all - as evidence for the existence of the creator, is seriously deluded!

Clearly he knows very little about any religion other than Christianity! Fact of the matter is that on examining this part it shows clearly that he knows very little even about Christianity itself!

Yes, my reader should expect that as a Muslim, I will agree with Dawkins in a great deal of his objections against Christianity; but he should not expect

me to be indifferent with respect to any uninformed fallacy that he speaks about Christianity or any other religion!

So the clear corruption of reason here on the part of the professor is simply that he makes the argument that: since the Christian book is contradictory and inconsistent, then there is no argument for God in all scripture, any scripture!

Now when at the start of it, he mentions “scriptural evidence for God” one cannot escape but wonder, what does he view of scriptural evidence? What is the nature of a scripture that could, if any at all, be called in his view; scriptural evidence? Well naturally, a mere text where a deity claims to be the almighty creator is not in itself, by any means; evidence! We still need to prove that this text is indeed a word of “God”! Now in the eyes of every rational person, not to mention Muslim scholars, this is achieved through two basic roots:

1 – Examining the authenticity of the text, all the way back to the followed apostle of the religion!

2 – Examining the knowledge revealed in the text itself!

Of course it has to be maintained that only as long as a clearly detailed and reliable record of history of the scripture – especially through the very first century after the apostle of the faith – is kept and verified for authenticity and continuity, may the scripture be deemed as an authentic authorship of the historical author or narrator to which it is originally ascribed.

Among the qualities we should expect to find in a body of scripture that is rightfully ascribed to the creator is:

1 – Its texts do not contradict with one another, according to the single unified authority of understanding of those texts, which is: the direct students of the prophet himself, not later philosophers or theologians.

2 – They include no information that could ever be PROVEN false in any way.

3 – They paint a consistent image of the creator's attributes, one that comes in perfect accordance with what every sane man should expect the attributes of the Lord of all creation to be. They do not teach irrational or incoherent meanings about the creator, His deeds, His intent or His attributes. (This is should actually come as number one, because if the basic tenets of a religion are rationally corrupt or incoherent; the scripture is certainly corrupt and the case is settled; no need to proceed!)

4 – They establish a binding moral code for mankind that defines ultimate justice and morality in no uncertain terms and on all levels: Right and wrong are definitive criteria of whatever it is that man is created to do on this Earth!

5 – They offer consistent meanings for all aspects of good and bad, pain and pleasure, purpose and justification in life and death and the afterlife that cannot be otherwise explained or understood properly!

6 – They are all evidently preserved and are easily accessible in the verifiably original tongue (language) of their revelation (alongside with complete knowledge of that tongue itself and the way students of the prophet understood it as well back in their time); otherwise translations and manipulations and the natural shortcomings of linguistic rephrasing can never be avoided, and would eventually leave the scripture valueless!

Those are some of the least characteristics any sane man should expect to find in a volume of scripture that is said *(today)* to be the word of "God"! If it is indeed a book left on Earth by a prophet of the Lord for the guidance of mankind, then it has to be a book of perfect wisdom, with everything in its right place and for its correct purpose, and essentially we have to be positive as we examine that book, that the way we understand its meanings, is the same way direct students of the Apostle himself understood it; we must be capable of verifying this, otherwise there can be no limit to the number of baseless interpretations every text or set of texts could be presumed to have!

Now, speaking of the Christian books of scripture, many Christian scholars would argue that the multitude of Aramaic and Greek manuscripts that have been discovered and piled up by far, of both the Old and the New Testament, increases their confidence in the reliability of the translations they now use,

since they prove to be rather identical! Well, this is great! But it still does not prove the authenticity of the original source from which all those manuscripts themselves are taking! I mean yes I now believe that the copies in your hands of those books are identical with the versions adopted in the fourth century by the church! But I say that even if you one day found the remains of a manuscript as ancient as the first century; this still doesn't prove that manuscript itself to be authentic in its origins! This is why we need to speak of the history of scripture in the first century under a well recorded and reliable authority of the disciples themselves! Christians do not have such an evidently continuous and undisturbed authority! The first century to them is admittedly a historical blur! They cannot even verify the authorship of any of those books to begin with!

I mean if religion X is indeed supposed to be the one religion of God that all humans should accept and live by till the end of times; is it rationally possible that the omniscient Lord almighty would make its book the one code for all generations to come, without leaving anywhere in the legacy of this religion or in that book itself a single document that could be proven today **without a speck of doubt, and with no room for any scholarly debate** to be the actual words of an actual messenger of His? How then would He demand that people accept this body of scripture as His own true word, and to the end of times? More essentially, if religion X was indeed true, and all humans to the end of times are supposed to accept it; is it possible that the very basic fundamentals of faith concerning the nature of the deity itself be left in religion X without a reliably clear, unambiguous and unquestionably authentic textual reference that stands the challenge of refutation by any of its opponents? Is it okay with Christians that after a fierce debate that went on for three centuries between radically different 'religions' concerning the very nature of God and Jesus; the faith only comes to be determined and sanctioned eventually by means of some voting under the command of an emperor in a religious council?

Christians often argue wishfully that the texts of the bible have always been at the heart of the Christian nation, so they cannot have been altered or lost! Well I have then to say: How far back in history can you prove this nation to

go? What is the Christian nation in the first place, when and where did it begin, and how do you define it? What form of a Christian nation – at all - can you speak of in the first century AD, or even in the first three centuries after Christ, before the foundation of the Roman Catholic Church in Pagan Rome? You do not have that “nation” in those early crucial centuries in the lifetime of your doctrine! Nowhere in history before the time of the Roman Emperor Constantine, did any “nation” of Christianity really come to existence, one that could be thought to have put the original authentic teachings of Christ at its heart as you would easily claim, and worked with all its power to preserve them; teachings that are indeed authorized by the true disciples of Jesus himself!

In fact Disciples of Christ were notoriously persecuted by both the Romans and the Jews in the first century, and most of them had to hide their faith and pray in their homes! There was no such a thing as “church” back then! So by what evidence can we accept a particular manuscript - even if it dates back to the first century – as evidently authentic, and as an authority of direct followers of Christ? How could there possibly be any continuous line of narration where we can determine with confidence that X listened to this text from Y, and Y, from Z, and Z from A, and A from B, all the way up to whoever it is that is said to be its author? This is nowhere to be found in Christianity, and the reason is clear! Our explanation for this fact is that the real religion of Jesus was never meant by the Lord to be the final religion to all mankind to the end of times, like most Christians believe! Jesus was not sent to teach the whole world about God, he was sent in a precise mission to the ‘lost sheep’ of Israel! If it were true that his teaching was supposed to be preached to the whole world, then God would’ve commanded *him* to take it on himself to do that, like Muhammad did; to gather around him an army and fight for the sake of the truth, or to take his followers and migrate to another land where he could found a new nation that would really work on spreading the message as it is - under his own direct authority, and that of his immediate students after him – to all nations of the world, and keep it preserved from then on!

But this was never the case with Jesus and his students! Jesus was never told to migrate to a place where he is not persecuted or where he could charge power and set up a keep for his followers, he was never told to fight the tyrants of the temple and other sworn enemies of the truth; this was not his mission! Instead he was told to keep warning the Israelites and preaching the truth to them until the time came and he was literally *picked up*; saved by Allah from his persecutors when they were charging at his doorstep! His true followers had to flee and hide their faith after he was raised in heaven lest the Romans or the Jews would kill them! There was no ‘church’, no state, no war, and no religious assignment by Jesus to his students to secure his teachings in the stronghold of a powerful nation and to spread them to the world after him, quite simply because that’s not why Jesus was sent! The book of God that Jesus taught to the Israelites was never meant by God to be the final book for all mankind! And by claiming that that book in their hands today is the final book for all mankind, Christians are indeed offending the creator because this means that He could not take the necessary measures – by commandment to His prophet and by preparing the necessary historical circumstances - for the sake of preserving this book and keeping it unaltered and untouched since the time of its revelation and for generations to follow! This mission (delivering a final religion and a universal law to all mankind and to the end of times, setting up a *kingdom* under the word of God) was appointed to Muhammad (sallalah Alihi wa sallam)! And this is precisely why the history of the first century of the Muslim nation under Muhammad himself was written in this particular way!

This is the fundamental problem that Christians face whenever they attempt to prove the authenticity of their books! There is a point in their history beyond which is nothing but darkness and ambiguity: All sorts of claims by all sorts of people, relating to Jesus and his followers; none of which is in the least verifiable or even traceable!

There were those who kept the laws of Moses, kept the Sabbath, as taught by Jesus himself, and claimed that to be the teaching of Jesus the human prophet of God, and others who claimed Jesus to be God himself incarnate, and to have laid off the law after his crucifixion, and to have drawn a totally

different path for his followers by his proclaimed resurrection! There were those who took Saul of Tarsus for an apostle and those who viewed him as an imposter! He reportedly had his fair share of arguments on faith with many disciples! So whose witness is to be trusted on those dark uncertain times? And how can it be obtained, this witness? It is simply: unaccountable; unverifiable!

It was a time of difference on the very foundations of the faith; a radical difference of religion that is! So to not be able to prove in a sound and reliable manner the authorship of those books, in relevance to the immediate students of Jesus, is to really stand upon nothing but wishful thinking; just like all followers of false religions do!

Now I'm not saying this because I'm a Muslim, for as a Muslim I certainly believe that Christianity has much more "reason" in it than Atheism, even with its irrational trinity doctrine! I'm saying this as a rational human being examining the Christian claim of validity for its sources of knowledge! I'm addressing with it not Christians alone, but every blind follower of an ancient book that ascribes itself to the creator of the universe!

((Say Bring forth your evidence, if thy are truthful))

A Christian just presumes – "romantically" if I may say - that since this is the faith that eventually prevailed under the name of Christianity, and under the power of the great Roman Church, then it must be the truth! Well, it mustn't! They can't help but wonder what if Arius really was right? And what if Constantine chose to favor his view over that of Athanasius rather than otherwise? Can such a fundamental difference be settled by a mere voting in a congress? Does the fact that more church leaders voted for X than those who voted for Y, make X by any kind of reason: the truth?

Scholars of Christianity would argue that the truth had to prevail in that particular congress because God must have wanted it to! I say you don't know that! First you have to verify the source of knowledge from whence you make this claim!

To claim that the congress there was guided by the Holy Ghost, is to apply circular logic here, because it is only through those very texts that were canonized and granted approval by a particular authority of religion, and interpreted in accordance with its selected faith, do you prove that the holy ghost had anything at all to do with the decision to canonize the texts! You still need to present evidence for the authenticity of the text, not to mention its interpretation! So no you cannot get away with claiming that the agreement the congress in Nicaea reached was guided by "God"!

So it all goes down to this: Some ancient figures of religion who reportedly wrote down what they heard, their reflections, their personal letters, maybe even speculations, about some important events in the life of Christ and his direct followers, people whose exact relation to the true disciples cannot be verified, sometimes even their very identity cannot be verified, and yet, the Church picks and chooses from among those many records, not according to a verifiable authenticity, but according to a particular creed of faith they had already chosen to agree upon! And there you go; the canon that's currently in your hand, carrying the presumptuous title: "the word of God"!

Yes indeed it is possible – rationally - that a lot of those events accounted for in those records be true! And it is no surprise that four or five authors of different books would take their stories from a common source, and then write them down, each in his own words. But you still have to know who those authors are and who that original source really was! The mere fact that this is what Athanasius – for example - chose to call the holy book of "God"; is no proof that any of it has anything to do with Jesus' true teachings and the creed of his true followers! I am not accusing the fathers of the church in any way of bad will or conspiracy against religion! However, with this very same proclaimed good will, all forms of horrendous crimes have been committed in the world, and all kinds of fallacious myth have been taken for granted and embraced as religion as well!

Not only was that canon a work of unverified unauthenticated selection, (on a model of: "believe first, and then select the text that matches, and burn or re-interpret all incompatible writings"!) even worse, translators came afterwards to put layers of their own – mostly unintentional and good willed

– manipulations; and yet it still remains to be called “the word of God” nevertheless!

It is interesting that I’m writing this lengthy discussion of Christian scripture in particular in response to a book that claims to be refuting **the existence of God**! Had the professor been born and brought up in perhaps a Hindu culture, this section of his book would have probably been an all-out attack against the Vedas or the Puranas rather than the Bible, under the same heroic tag of refuting **all forms of scripture** and disproving the existence of the creator, and consequently, this part of my answer to it would have been discussing the history of Hindu scripture instead!

Thus I say it is supposed to be clear enough that he’s not scoring anything at all – with regards to his particular objective – by disproving the Christian scripture! Because as we pointed out earlier, proving the invalidity of a particular book of scripture is one thing, and proving the invalidity of all scripture altogether is another, not to mention of course disproving the creator, which is the object of this chapter in Dawkins’ book!

We do agree that there are indeed a whole lot of false and unverifiable volumes of scripture attributing their origins to the creator, containing all kinds of myth and legend, everywhere in the world! This doesn’t in any way mean – by simple logic - that there isn’t anywhere on Earth, a system of “religious knowledge” that actually applies strict rules of scrutiny in dealing with scriptures and evidence, and that is verifiably the true message of the creator to mankind!

I’m almost certain that the professor doesn’t know – for example – what the word (Isnad إسناد) means, or that in Islam it is actually “Haram” (forbidden) for a Muslim to be a blind follower (muqallid مقلد), and just copy the faith and deeds of a religious figure that he venerates, without learning his evidence! And only under conditions of incapability – for one reason or another - to learn enough of his religion (the minimum that every Muslim should learn, plus the ability to examine arguments of Imams of Fiqh on his own, weigh the evidence and decide what ruling to follow), may a Muslim be excused to follow a trustworthy Sheikh in Fatwa, just as he may be

excused in eating the meat of “Maytah”: a dead un-slaughtered animal, in a condition of necessity where there is no other choice!

So professor, it wouldn’t hurt you to just say: **I don’t know**! In fact, we would respect your honesty if you did! But to make such arrogant claims and generalize them on everything that is religion and scripture in the world; this is by no means an acceptable scholarly position, neither does it have anything at all to do with rationality or scholarship!

It’s quite easy indeed to make the brave unscholarly declaration that “All followers of all religions of the world are following nonsense, and they accept it only because they came to the world to find their parents following it”! Nothing is easier! But can the professor afford the burden of proof that he places over his head by making this claim, and attempting to prove it through the examination of “scripture”? Can he be honest enough and declare – at least – that proving the corruption of Christian scripture does not prove the corruption of all scripture from all religions in the world?

The scholarly approach to understanding religious scripture.

Okay, since we are discussing scripture; Here’s a brief explanation of the proper scholarly methodology of examining people’s religious beliefs that I’m almost certain the professor is not familiar with:

In order to prove a certain group of people wrong about what they believe, you first have to make sure that this ***is*** indeed what they are supposed to believe according to their religion: Only by making reference to their own valued authorities of religion! You should examine the way THEY understand their scriptures, making reference – again – to their most reliable sources in that (reliable to them of course)! If you happen to find that there are debates amongst their scholars on understanding a particular text, with different explanations for it adopted in their scholarly literature, then you should exhibit a minimal degree of scholar integrity, and mention that there is indeed a difference amongst scholars of that faith on interpreting that particular text, and display all scholarly ‘considerable’ interpretations, even if you find that among them is a particular one that you don’t like because it

blows away your objection! I say "considerable" because not every debate among scholars of a certain religion is tolerable in that religion! And this is why you will have to examine how they manage to expel certain interpretations and differences as baseless, and accordingly how they come to choose the right interpretation!

You will need to examine: By what reference they determine that this is indeed the intent of the original author of the text, because if they have no reliable source for knowing this; they have nothing! A text that is open to all kinds of interpretations that may ever be invented by scholars of that religion is in the majority of cases as good as no text at all! And by "open" I do not mean that false interpretations *do not* take place to that text at all, there is no such text in human notion, and there will always be ignorance and human error; I rather mean that the scripture of that religion lacks a rigid reference of understanding that could be proven by those who know it that this is indeed the only right way to understand those texts!

Of course if you're sufficiently qualified to examine and criticize those different interpretations and maybe even prove which one of them is evidently the correct way to understand the text in question (in the original language of that scripture and its interpretations of course!), then by all means be our guest, put forth your evidence, and enter this arena of scholarly criticism from its proper entrance! But to claim that your knowledge of Zoology or even philosophy qualifies you to mess around freely in any discipline of human knowledge; this is absolutely intolerable by any self-respecting scholar in any field of human knowledge!

Yes of course he will find – for example – scholars of Islam differing on the interpretation of one text or another, this is a natural characteristic of human beings; but what bearing does this natural phenomenon have on the reliability, the usefulness, the validity, or even the actual meaning of this or that scripture, is a question that is obviously way beyond the professor's scholarly qualification!

I am telling him clearly that not everything he finds in the works of even the most highly esteemed scholars of Islam is by necessity correct, in the lights of Islamic sources from which they are all supposed to be taking!

It has become a common trend by many evangelists as they attempt to convert ignorant Muslims to Christianity and "spread the word", to pick quotations from the works of Muslim innovators, or even errors or misquotations from the works of eminent Muslim scholars, to support their outright lies! They intentionally resort to this twisted forgery in order to pass their false claims about Islam to their audiences! And although I'm not accusing the professor of deliberately resorting to false sources on Islam, I'm pointing out that his sources on Islam are not any different from theirs; for after all, the majority of misconceptions currently predominant in the West about Islam stems – particularly - from the work of evangelists, missionaries and similarly oriented writers!

One of the most renowned Arabian Christian missionaries specialized in attacking Islam (a particular bishop who goes by the name Zakareya Butros); is famously known – through his televised shows aimed at converting Muslims - to rely for his knowledge of Islam on the "Encyclopedia Britannica"! I mean, imagine a student of physics referring to "*Star wars*" or Spielberg's "*Back to the future*" in preparing a scholarly research on the theory of relativity that actually aims at refuting it!

There are of course Muslim scholars who follow the correct methodology (manhaj) and those, on the other hand who follow an innovated methodology! There are those who have minor mistakes, and those who have major, methodological innovations! So how do we know that, and how do we deal with their writings? By readily condemning all those who follow another "mosque" (as in Church) with another "tradition" different from ours? No! We simply know it by examining ***evidence*** from verifiable sources!

All estimable scholars of Islam make a clear distinction between the infallibility of authentic scripture, and the fact that all humans are vulnerable to making mistakes! So a scholar may indeed go wrong, but an authentic

scripture may not! Thus, one of the phenomena that characterize the true religion is that in Islam you can actually **prove** those who go wrong – dealing with indisputable principles of Islam - to have indeed gone wrong, with solid reference to sound reliable evidence and verifiable interpretation; it would not be my own theological interpretation versus yours or my own "Church tradition" versus yours; but the evidently **right** position, versus the identifiably **wrong**!

There is an integral body of scripture – the understanding of which is itself "scripture" in a way, as it is inherited from the Salaf: Disciples and their immediate students – that sets the standard by which every scholar of Islam, and every work of Islamic literature is to be judged! It is a profoundly different process of knowledge from anything any atheist has ever seen under a tag of religion; and it has nothing to do with the way a Church theologian – for example - works to produce "new" interpretations of old scriptures just for the sake of making them qualify for the new mainstream of thought in his society!

The text is either authentic, and you do possess an evidently **correct** way (or ways) to understand it and work with it, or it isn't and you're simply working your own way with philosophy in a pathetic attempt to just pick and choose, or make the text more appealing and acceptable! Forging new meanings for an existing text; is as much of a crime against the truth and against all mankind as forging an entirely new text and attributing it to God! If you have no clue to knowing the true intention of the original author of a certain text, and what he exactly meant to say in those texts, then you simply **don't know what the text means**, and whatever you claim it actually meant; is nothing but presumption or cold fakery! The fact that it could be interpreted in a variety of ways, does not make any particular one of those ways by necessity the true meaning of the text as intended by its author!

It is amazing that when a Muslim scholar holds this position in dealing with scriptural texts, he is easily accused of narrow-mindedness, "literalism" and lack of "flexibility"! The same accusation goes against any scholar of any religion who may claim that any given text of scripture should continue to be understood in the same traditional way! He is readily labeled a

"fundamentalist" as though it were a crime or a moral charge against him! *"You're sticking to the old interpretation of scripture? Oh the backwardness!"* Atheists would call orthodox scholars of Islam '*radical Zealots*' because they forcefully reject every innovated understanding of scripture, but at the very same time, those very same atheists would accuse other scholars of "picking and choosing" and forging new interpretations to a text that is rationally supposed to have a single meaning that is indeed the right intention of its author; so my question to those atheists is: **What is it that you really want then**? What kind of scripture and what kind of scholarly approach to it are you willing to accept as the true revelation from your creator? Well, we already know the answer to this one, don't we?! The words "creator", "scripture", and "holy book" are banished from their personal dictionaries! It is their personal blind **faith** that there is no such a thing as a heavenly revealed scripture on this Earth at all!

It is amazing how the word "fundamentalist" is actually used today to disdain a religious scholar and bring him down in the eyes of people of his religion! If you're a man who believes that his scripture is the truth, and that the right way to understand it is the way the direct students of its first teacher understood it, and you – thus – reject and dismiss every new understanding that claims to be the true intent of the authors of that scripture in contradiction with or in deviance from the original understanding; are you – in the eyes of any self-respecting man of religion – to be viewed as a danger to followers of that scripture? This is unbelievable! If your scripture was always understood to deliver the message X, and all followers of this religion ever since the time of its prophet have taken it to mean X, and then after many centuries have passed, and out of nowhere somebody comes along to say that this understanding is not true, or it's only true under certain conditions or that it actually means Y rather than X, claiming an unprecedented interpretation [10]; by what reason is this new understanding to

[10] A recent example to this is the sad "historical" incident when some woman in America managed to convince some ignorant Muslims to have – for the very first time in the history of this religion - a female Imam lead a mixed congregation in Salat, claiming that it is okay and that this is the right way to understand the scripture! None of them could possibly present any evidence that this was ever taught, done or accepted back in the first three centuries of Islam, or any time later for that matter, because the exact opposite is the case! In fact I believe that only few of them actually know where to look if they were to search for such evidence at all! Some of them never even heard about something called "Ijma'" in Islam

be given any weight at all against the original one? Are you – perhaps – claiming that the prophet of your religion *failed* to teach his immediate students the true understanding of the revealed texts of their religion, and people were left blind about the true intent of those texts all until you came along to fix this problem?

What on earth could be more irrational than a claim that I am free to understand a certain text in whichever way that suits me best, not in accordance with what it was **truly intended to mean by its author**? This is not poetry or fictional literature here that we could enjoy a mental luxury of contemplating all the possible ways a man could interpret them and enjoy them! This is direct teaching and instruction on the way a man has to live, in order to satisfy the purpose of his existence in this world! So you either understand its correct meaning or you don't!

This is why every time a Muslim "thinker" (like for example, the renowned lecturer Tariq Ramadan and his great-uncle in Egypt Jamal Al-Banna) comes along with a proposition to offer us a "new" or" modern" interpretation of the Quran, he is effectively frowned upon; actually "hammered" by serious scholars of Islam, because quite simply; he is committing an act of forgery! He is committing a crime that is only a slighter version of the one that early apostles of the Church committed, which resulted in the loss of the true religion of Prophet Jesus and his followers: Manipulating the religion to bring it to the liking of ignorant people of the time! This is obviously – whatever it will turn out to be - not the meaning those texts are meant to deliver! Those who dislike the way the texts themselves read, and the way they were originally understood, when they fail to manipulate or dismiss the authority (refute the authenticity) of those texts themselves, they find no other choice but to manipulate their

إجماع (consensus) and the authority that is given to it by the scripture itself! And yet in their unfortunate ignorance, they would find this innovation plausible and in accord with what they call "the true spirit of the Qur'an"! What spirit? If we did not have a verifiable body of reference by which we could refute such ignorant assaults against our religion; then we might as well consider leaving it behind altogether, for it would be all the same! If it's okay for me to interpret it in whatever way I wish, then it should also be okay for me to obey only what I like, and to even break free from Sharee'a altogether, by means of some twisted "new interpretation" that I find to be plausible! And then we might as well wait for our Muslim version of Paul of Tarsus who invented Christianity and claimed that submitting to the Law of Moses was optional!

MEANING and claim that they are open for "social contextualization" and "re-interpretation"!

And instead of a society of true believers that is willing faithfully to reshape the community and change their own lives to better observe the teachings of their Lord (which is what the very meaning of the Arabic word "Islam" demands), you get a society of ingrates and hypocrites who are seeking to reshape the religion itself to suit their desires and 'moral tastes'!

So while some proclaimed "Scholars" in the Muslim world may find it a plausible approach – falsely so - to re-read the texts (practicing what is dubbed: selective reading), the orthodox: evidently and rationally correct scholarly position with religious texts is to stick to the way the disciples themselves understood them! They've got to understand that the difference between a truly God-given law, and a manmade law, is that the God-given law in itself, and in the exact way it was revealed, understood and practiced ever since the time of its revelation, is by necessity of reason applicable to people of all nations and ages it was revealed to address! And in the case of the final religion of Islam: To all mankind and to the end of times!

It is a FALSE outcome of ignorance and misconception – even if it comes out from certain officially authorized scholars in the nation of Islam – to claim that with the progress of time, people have to change *the way they understand* the scripture! The very same rules that were applicable some fourteen centuries ago MUST be applicable today, and in no contradiction or conflict with anything that proves in any nation or in any age to be true or to be in man's best interest!

The point is: Only in the true religion of the creator, and with the evidently **proper** understanding of its texts, should you expect to find this ongoing consistency and perfect harmony of religion with everything that is rational and useful to man, that ever comes to be discovered or invented!

Now true scripture of the Lord – with its only right understanding - could indeed come in conflict with certain cultural norms, philosophies, beliefs or preferences that vary from one nation to another and prevail from one century to another (just as it should come in conflict with all false systems of

faith), but this is not indicatory of the least sign of a problem with the religion or the scripture itself, and it certainly doesn't mean that the understanding of this religion and its scriptures has to be changed!

If you don't like a certain commandment of the evidently true teachings of heaven; or don't find it to fit with your current cultural norm or social behavior, this doesn't in any way mean that this commandment is **wrong** or inappropriate, or that this particular way of understanding it is no longer to be observed! It actually means that your society suffers from a serious problem with its cultural norms and traditions; one that has to be examined and cured with wisdom, to help this society rebound on a social scale to the true will of their creator!

If I knew that my scripture is the truth and is the perfect wisdom for all mankind, I should not be required to search for a way to make it fit your – or anybody else's – cultural and social standards! I should rather address you with reason and whatever evidence I have, to prove to you that the problem is actually with the mainstream of thought that is currently prevailing in your own society, not with those teachings I am propagating and promoting! And that's exactly what I'm doing in this book!

I know that what I'm saying here may indeed be disturbing to many western Muslims, but I urge them to reconsider their ways and examine their true intentions and motives when they pick this or that scholar and take his Fatwa! By what standards do they judge him? By the fact that he may be closer to the way the western people live than another "fundamentalist" scholar? Is this what it means to be a Muslim (who submits and surrenders)? To seek every Fatwa that suits me best, not those that come from the more pious, the furthest away from innovation and the more knowledgeable in circles of ('ulama' العلماء)? Is this the kind of religion you expected your Lord would demand of you to follow when you testified that He is the only true authority in your life?

Do not let yourself be intimidated by the accusations of haters, because they will not stop until they have got you out of your way! Yes people could still chop off the hand of a thief or stone an adulterer – for example - according

to the law of Islam, today in a scientifically advanced society of the twenty first century and do not find that to be in conflict with any evident facts, or to hinder the progress of empirical sciences like Medicine or Chemistry – for example - in any way! In fact, the application of an evidently powerful and complete system of justice in a nation will certainly pave this nation's way not only for material development and welfare, but for advancement on all other human levels as well! I know – not out of pride and blind faith, but out of evidence – that all social and spiritual diseases of the west can be cured by no other code of wisdom but that of Islam! Not in the way a certain society wishes it to be practiced, but the way it truly and evidently **should** be practiced!

So when an ignorant comes out to speak in the name of Islam and say that such rulings are outdated, or that the texts where they are taught should not be taken literally any more, or should be re-read; this is in fact a liar that should be put to punishment, or an ignorant who should be taught the true wisdom in his religious scriptures in the only proper way to understand them and live by them, before he proceeds to spread his own ignorance about the faith!

We can still do great achievements of industry and technology under a total submission to the rulings of Islam, the way Muslims of the first centuries of Islam submitted to them! And indeed it will be guided with wisdom and purposefulness on all levels! History testifies for this, and we all know that there once was a time when Europe was indeed crawling in sheer ignorance and superstition under the authority of the church, while an extremely prosperous nation in all fields of science and knowledge was enjoying the rational and intellectual richness of its religion; under the laws of sharee'a! So no, we certainly will NOT be living in caves, or criminalizing medicine – like the Catholic Church notoriously did in the Dark ages! - or banning the use of anything that is evidently useful to man, if we submitted to all rulings of Islam, in the exact way that early Muslims (Salaf) did!

This is simply because we know the correct way of understanding texts that are evidently and verifiably authentic, and are indeed complete and perfect wisdom! If you don't like the way Orthodox Muslims look or dress or talk or

practice their rituals, then this is your problem; and it certainly does not mean that there's something wrong with Islam, or with the way those Muslims understand it and live by it! When some atheist – for example - whines about or makes fun of what the western society would look like if all women on the streets of Europe decided one day to cover up in 'Burqa'; this is by no means an argument against the moral superiority of the 'Burqa'! He's expressing his own frustration with a ruling that would obviously deprive him from a free pleasure that he had no right to enjoy in the first place! So fact of the matter is; he is the one that should be fixed here, not the laws of Sharee'a!

There will always come a point where you have to say: **This** is the only evidently – and rationally - proper way – or ways - to understand those texts; and that's how it is: So take it or leave it! I do have the evidence that I claim to have, to prove to you that I'm not telling you to follow an innovation or a philosophy that I or my ancestors invented, or any man for that matter! So sit down and listen to it if you are honestly searching for the true will of your creator!

The claim that any text of scripture is to be understood within the cultural context of the time and place of its reading, not the context and original understanding of its revelation, is simply like claiming that if you left a written will for your children after you, and some of them did not like its literal meaning, you should have no problem with them taking it "metaphorically" or making up a clearly different meaning from the one you specifically intended and sought to express! It's simply a claim that the Lord who revealed this text, had no particular meaning for it, and has no problem with people claiming whatever meaning they see fit for it!

You have – for example – texts that speak of Holy war in the Quran; but today many people in the west do not see them fit just because there isn't any such war going on where they live; So how do they justify what they read in the Quran? They may find no trouble at all in saying: The Lord was not talking about a physical war, but a *spiritual* one; or this is only a metaphor not a literal teaching, etc.! This is a clear lie! He either did mean a physical war – with historical evidence to support this understanding - or he

meant a spiritual war or both! The meaning cannot be changed today to suit the way those people – or their societies - want it to be! It has to be understood properly, in its right context, and the way to do that is certainly not by making up a new "interpretation"!

This manipulation of meaning is exactly what theologians of Christianity do in their "apologetics" all the time, and find no trouble whatsoever with that; especially with texts of the Old Testament! Both Christian theologians and those Muslims who would follow such a method, are to be charged with clear forgery! The only difference is that while Muslims still have their evidently preserved understanding of those texts that stand all scholarly challenges of refutation (as we will demonstrate in Volume 2), Christians do lack the texts and evident explanations that would justify those stories of war and violence they find in the Old Testament, in the light of what the New Testament teaches about God, especially with the particularly vile and indecent language in which those texts are written; so they know they have no choice but resort to innovated interpretations!

As for Muslim scholars; and virtually for any sage man of religion who respects himself, his scripture, and the direct students of his prophet, any innovated interpretation of a text is – quite rationally - viewed to be something the prophet himself and his students **never knew or heard anything about**; so the question would then be: did the Lord address them by a text none of them understood properly, or managed to apply as He willed in their lives?! Or did He lead them astray instead of guiding them to the proper way (which was only discovered later in history)?

The point my reader - and to not go any further from our subject matter here - is that the professor is certainly unaware of the depth of the ocean of knowledge and wisdom, before which he's only a child building a sand castle at the beach! So superficially and so "comically" he addresses the question of "scripture" here, and makes conclusions that he wishfully thinks should condemn and criminalize all religions and all scriptures on earth!

So he may keep debating as many more Christian theologians as he wishes, proving them – as he may think – incoherent and contradictory as he would

enjoy to do; this doesn't by any means put him even remotely close to the truth, and doesn't change the fact that there is indeed so much that he still has to learn, before he could come forth with any scholarly criticism against any religion, not to mention ALL "religion" and "scripture"!

The professor starts off in this section on scripture by saying:

> *"A common argument, attributed among others to C. S. Lewis (who should have known better), states that, since Jesus claimed to be the Son of God, he must have been either right or else insane or a liar: 'Mad, Bad or God'. Or, with artless alliteration, 'Lunatic, Liar or Lord'."*

Well, clearly this is wishful thinking! It's no argument at all! I do agree with the professor on that point though: There is clearly another rational possibility that Lewis forgets here: people may have been telling lies about Jesus after his time, and calling them the word of God!

When he then mentions that there is no historical evidence to prove that he ever said anything about his being divine, or made any similar claim, he is indeed making a sound argument! There clearly isn't, and Christians cannot answer to that! All they have is their own choice of interpretation of certain texts that could indeed be interpreted in other distinct ways! There is no proof for an original understanding that could be referred to, and there is indeed no proof for the authenticity of the texts as we argued earlier!

They usually put forth the argument that so many historians telling this very same account could not possibly be all mistaken! And I say yes they could! When a man makes up a story, and people for any sort of reasons find themselves compelled and motivated to believe it (perhaps because they trust him when in reality he is not to be trusted), and then it is passed on to following generations, it becomes a tradition so dominant that it would be no surprise at all that you find it mentioned as an historical fact in as many historical accounts as you would find the story of the resurrection of Jesus, for example! Ask any Buddhist priest about historical evidence for accounted stories or miracles of any Buddha or Avatar that he believes in (a

god incarnate as well, by the way!); he would give you volumes of such accounts!

So there must be a sound methodology to examine historical claims and stories and identify what is reliable and what is not, other than the *childish* position that anything that suits the Church creed and is authorized by the fathers has to be the truth! If indeed Christianity was meant to be taught to the whole world and to the end of times, then its methodology of authenticating scriptures and tracing narratives all the way back to their original authors must be superior to all other religions and to any method any historian ever dreamt of; after all if it is indeed God's word to all generations of man that are yet to follow, then it's God's intent to have it preserved for them in a rationally plausible and verifiable manner! After all, the religion was not revealed to those early fathers in Rome, Greece or Alexandria, and they certainly never met Jesus Christ in person, did they?! This perfect methodology I speak of is nowhere to be found in the Christian tradition, just as it is the case with every other false doctrine!

Thus I agree, wholeheartedly, with this statement:

> *"The fact that something is written down is persuasive to people not used to asking questions like: 'Who wrote it, and when?' 'How did they know what to write?' 'Did they, in their time, really mean what we, in our time, understand them to be saying?' 'Were they unbiased observers, or did they have an agenda that coloured their writing?'" (Dawkins p.92)*

I am absolutely proud to invite every honest reader, to read about an intricate scientific methodology of historical verification the likes of which the world has never seen! A science in Islam that is known as: "Ilmul Hadith": "The science of Isnad", and "ilmul Rijal" "the science of men (narrators)". When I speak of a methodology to examine stories, their narrators, the continuity of lines of narration of every particular story, the exact verifiable status of honesty and truthfulness of each and every single narrator and the examination of conditions and circumstances he lived in, I'm talking about something that Muslims are obligated to practice and hold for an essential

necessity to verify every narrative that is ascribed to their prophet or to his direct followers! This is not something we now wish we had Muslims of old take good care of ever since the first century after the prophet, so we could identify what exactly is evidently the words of prophet Muhammad and what is not! This indeed has been the job of this nation ever since the death of the prophet! Under a powerful rule of his direct disciples, the prophet left behind a nation that has religion at its core, with people not afraid to spill as much blood as it should take for the defense and protection of every single word that qualifies as scripture! And as soon as the first signs of people making mistakes or making up lies about the prophet started to show up in the time of the first disciple kings (Khalifas) (after the events of “Fitnah”) [11], the nation was immediately called to arms and Disciple scholars and their immediate students practiced a very conspicuous process of naming every narrator and examining his religiosity and his honesty. It has to be made clear that this oral practice of memorizing the name of the narrator along with the narrative, and delivering it as such, started at the time of the disciples themselves, during their lifetimes and under their authority, which is the reason why we are now followers of the only religion in the world that rejects any scriptural text that has a broken chain of narration or one that doesn’t go all the way back to the disciples and from them to the prophet himself!

Again we remind the reader that prophet Muhammad did not leave behind him a number of scattered and persecuted disciples who were in fear for their own lives, as was the case with Prophet Jesus (praise be upon all prophets) and his followers! He left behind him strong warriors and kings who evidently had one and only one cause in their lives: The total submission of the entire nation to their Lord and the preservation and the

[11] The fact the scholars of the first century like Ibn Seereen, senior student of disciples (tabe’ee) – as cited in sahih Muslim - notoriously decided to ask every narrator to name his men on narration (his sources of narration that came to be called “rijal’ in chains known as “Isnad”), and to verify the status of those men, in safeguard against the threat of having innovators mix the lies they forge in their narrations to support their innovations, with authentic narrations (especially Shi’ites whose innovation appeared as early as thirty years after the death of the prophet), is by all means a point of pride to all Muslims, and is clear demonstration of the heavenly wisdom for which this major conflict (Fitnah) had to appear so early in the history of the Muslim nation! Any honest contemplator would have no choice but to admit that the history of this nation was actually forged by the creator in this exact way for the sake of preserving this religion like no other religion ever had a chance to be preserved!

powerful propagation of the true religion throughout the world! Those noble holders of the religion were never weak or scattered, and they were not only twelve – or even a hundred or more - students, that had to flee for their lives and thus very little is known – and ambiguously enough - about what happened to them or how many of them really kept firm grasp on their faith in their prophet after he left them! NO! We're talking about tens of thousands of students and sincere followers here; with strength of faith and of will unmatched in the documented history of any other nation! No other prophet of Allah was given this kind of plentiful, powerful and sincere following companions!

What we *know* about this first nation and how fiercely it fought for the faith, makes us see clearly that historical conditions were actually *shaped* by the creator for this nation to rise for one purpose: the preservation of the final message of truth for the whole world to see, all the way to the end times!

The study and examination of authenticity of which the professor speaks here is indeed an essential craft for which an entire nation was built here; with the very blood of its believers I might add! I'm not going to speak of the fact that the Quran is the only book on Earth that has survived for fourteen centuries without a single letter manipulated or altered! Everybody knows that! I rather urge the reader to open any book of Hadith today and see for himself how Muslims do not accept any story about their prophet and his immediate followers unless it has a continuous line of well known and scrutinized narrators going all the way back to the prophet (Isnad)! The slightest reason to doubt in any (Isnad) (series of narrators: X took from Y, and Y from Z and Z from A, and A from B, and so on all the way to the prophet or the disciple) is enough to undermine the reliability of a text and render it powerless as evidence in Islam, according to detailed rules and conditions of scholars of Hadith! I ask: In what other process of historical documentation in the whole world, do you find a similar methodology of scholarly verification and authentication of scripture?

The author then comes to this point:

> *"Robert Gillooly shows how all the essential features of the Jesus legend, including the star in the east, the virgin birth, the veneration*

> *of the baby by kings, the miracles, the execution, the resurrection and the ascension are borrowed – every last one of them - from other religions already in existence in the Mediterranean and Near East region."*

Now let me explain the problem with this particular reasoning that he applies here! Regardless of how reliable "Robert Gillooly" is as an authority to speak of the issue in hand – he might as well refer to a plumber or a comic book writer for that matter! - , the bold claim that all similarities between different religions have only one explanation; that they copied from one another: is blind falsehood! It brings to my mind the kind of reasoning behind the belief that since so many species look alike, and share similar biophysical properties, and have the property of genetic re-adaptation, then they must have all had a common "primitive" ancestor! It's no surprise that a Darwinist would think this way!

However I must state that I agree that much of the Christian tradition *is* indeed copied from Pagan religions of old, especially the Roman Catholic traditions, due to evidence that cannot be discussed in detail in this volume (it's enough to say for now that there is not a single evidence to prove that Jesus or any of his disciples ever taught these traditions!). I also have to say that clearly – and evidently so - much of the Christian doctrine was indeed forged as such to appeal to pagan people of Greece and Rome!

But in all cases: Without evidence, you certainly can't jump to the general conclusion that all similarities between different religions should only mean that they all "copied" from one another!

Is it not a rational possibility that certain practices of worship were taught by a true prophet of "God" to an ancient people of old, and were taught again, many centuries later, to another nation by another prophet? After all it is a single creator who sends all true messengers and prophets to nations of mankind, and who has been doing this – as evident in Islamic scripture – ever since the dawn of mankind! Even Adam himself was a prophet who taught his offspring about God! The fact that people do have the tendency to waste knowledge, and get their religions corrupted with time and mutilated with myth and fallacy (and people do tend to copy those myths and get

influences interchanged), and that their innovations do accumulate in layers and layers with time; is undeniable! However it does not mean that every similarity in certain religious practices or even in beliefs in particular miracles between two distinct religions is by necessity due to this corruption or to mutual influence and copying!

The point is: You *cannot* make the conclusion that Christianity copied this particular faith or this particular practice of worship from one or more previous old religions, on the basis of similarity alone!

Atheists need to be taught that the fact that they do not know about evidence, any form of evidence in this area of human knowledge, doesn't mean that such evidence does not exist!

Of course for a man with a set of beliefs like that of the professor, it is no surprise that at the face of it, all people of religion are nothing but blind followers and copycats for as far as he's concerned! This is so easy to claim … isn't it? Yes indeed! Who cares what knowledge or evidence any of those poor people think they really have? It's all nonsense anyway!

Yet they'd say to whoever asks them: *"This is only my theory any way; I know that I could be wrong!*"

Well, no you don't! You wouldn't be making your case the way Dawkins does in his book, if you really had any room for the slightest possibility that you might indeed be wrong about (religion)! You wouldn't even recognize that there is indeed a whole lot of knowledge that you still have to sit down and LEARN – free from prejudice - before you could take such an attitude! So the truth is; professor Dawkins is just as much a man of blind "faith" as every other 'popularizer' of a false system of convictions and beliefs!

Bear with me my kind reader and you will see how many more times I will manage to demonstrate this fact to you.

He then proceeds to state the fact that there is no rational reason or a speck of evidence that makes us believe the four canonical books of Christianity to be any more "true" as "word of God" than other books overlooked and neglected by the ecclesiastic council!

It's interesting how in a footnote he draws some examples that might demonstrate how inaccurate many translations of Aramaic words into Greek could indeed result in devastating manipulations of meaning, and we do agree to that in general.

However, what I cannot overlook in that footnote is how in the middle of his argument against manipulative translations, he quotes a particular Indian (Pakistani) '*murtad'* (a revert from Islam) who nicknames himself (Ibn Warraq) to raise the argument that Islam, as well, is accused of the same practices of mistranslation! Ibn Warraq claims, as mentioned by the professor that the belief that Muslim martyrs are rewarded seventy two virgins in heaven is based upon the manipulation of a word by translators which in reality doesn't mean "virgin"! I quote:

> *"The only competitor for the title of champion constructive mistranslation of all time also concerns virgins. Ibn Warraq has hilariously argued that in the famous promise of seventy-two virgins to every Muslim martyr, 'virgins' is a mistranslation of 'white raisins of crystal clarity" (Dawkins, p. 96)*

Oh yes it is hilarious indeed! I cannot help but laugh at the use of such a quotation in this particular context! The man is desperately trying to make the point that the problems he thinks he has found with Christian scripture are typically to be found in all other scriptures all the same! It is a real pity!

Well, let alone the fact that this particular Ibn Warraq is an admitted enemy of Islam (with a book titled: Why I Am NOT a Muslim!), I urge the fair reasonable reader to answer to this question: What on earth does the ARABIAN Muslim understanding of the ARABIC Muslim scripture have to do with the problem that Christians have with mistranslation of scriptures from Aramaic to Greek to English? By what means of reason could such an argument be given any scholarly value whatsoever?

Here's the hilarious part: This Ibn Warraq is claiming that Muslims all across the fourteen centuries of their history have misunderstood the clear Arabic words of their scripture; he actually claims that this is because the

Qur'an was originally "written" in Syriac rather than Arabic! I mean, which planet did that man really come from? He thinks that Muslims of the world just found this book one day by accident in a box in some cave, and started "translating" it like some ancient archeological finding! And this man here, the respectable professor of biology, is actually quoting him, and using this bad joke as evidence to prove that Muslims suffer from the problem of "mistranslation" of scripture as well! What translation and what scripture? Does this man even know what he's talking about?

This is one of the worst examples I have seen in this book of exactly what he claims to be at war with: Blind faith, false reference, lack of evidence, unscholarly argumentation and unfounded prejudice! He might as well go as far as quoting comic book writers to support his position, and guess what; his followers would accept it all the same!

On the very next page he actually consults a professor of German language (G. A. Wells) who questions the historical validity of the existence of Jesus altogether!

Well, I generally have no problem with a professor of language writing about history or religion! However, a figure of academia as prominent as the professor is expected to take great care: who exactly he's quoting, in what field of knowledge, on what basis and for what end! If – for example - I'm not a scholar of physics, then I shouldn't go quote a professor of language on a claim that destroys the consensus of physicists and actually destroys physics itself altogether! Suppose a historian one day wrote a book that refutes a mainstream position in medicine! By what authority could an uneducated layperson (with respect to the field of Medicine), agree with this historian and quote his claim despite the consensus of all physicians throughout history that opposes his claims?

I'd be very happy to see the professor examine the evidence on both sides in a scholarly manner, to back up this extreme view he is citing here with anything even remotely close to a **scholarly argument**, or at least to show us why he thinks it may be worth serious consideration! But obviously he's only throwing a smoke bomb! It's like saying: "Oh and you know what?

There are actually people who think that Jesus was never even born in the first place!" Well yes of course there are such people! So what? This is called child-play, my kind reader, not scholarly argumentation!

He knows that such writings that question the very existence of Jesus, are not at all worthwhile, and account for nothing really, but he would mention them anyway! He would do anything, anything at all, to attack religion, no matter how cheap, unscholarly and uninformed his arguments are!

He ends this section with a "Journalist" comment on the famed Novel: The Da-Vinci Code, pointing out that Christians should not be very upset with it, because after all, according to him, both the Novel and the scriptures it may oppose are all fiction from start to end! Now, is such a comment expected to offer any valuable argument or evidence of any form that supports his position towards the creator or towards "scripture" and "religion" in general, not to mention Christianity itself? Not at all! So what is he doing, really?

It's clearly not a question of 'evidence' now, is it?!

On the Argument from Admired Religious Scientists!

This is in fact the most hilarious of all attempts by the professor for an argument thus far! All it comes down to is the already self-evident fact that it makes no difference at all how many "intelligent" men believe or don't believe in a certain faith; this doesn't make it the truth! You can count as many revered and honored historical figures in the west or anywhere in the world, who were atheists, this certainly does not make atheism the truth! You can bring forth all the statistics in the world that may prove that the majority of high IQs in the world were atheists, it still proves nothing!

This is the very same argument that every blind follower clings to whenever something within him starts pushing him towards doubt and disbelief! A voice speaks within him saying: "Calm down, sleep tight and leave those thoughts behind! There's no way that all those great men who accepted this religion were mistaken; they must have an answer!"!

Atheists, like all holders of false beliefs do play that very same trick! And that's exactly what the professor is doing in this part! No longer is he searching for evidence as he should be! He is now telling Christians that if they think the greatest number of smart people in the world were Christians; they're mistaken, they were actually atheists! Well great! So what? Where's the truth? What are you proving?

Nothing!

Just look at this statement:

> *"What is remarkable is the polar opposition between the religiosity of the American public at large and the atheism of the intellectual elite"* .. (Dawkins, p. 100)

Remarkable for whom? And what does it prove?

I couldn't care less what faith all the elites of the world would choose! I couldn't care less what those scientists who claimed to be Christians really believed! I couldn't care less what Darwin did or did not say on his deathbed! I couldn't care less what Dawkins will do when death eventually comes to take him! (Although of course I do hope for his sake that he reconsiders his choices before it's too late)!

The point is; any sane respectable man should not hang his faith on the choices of other men like himself! This blind appeal to intellectual authorities is only a big issue for those who seriously lack evidence for their faith, and suffer from deep holes of doubt within their souls! Only those who chose to believe for the wrong reasons and on false evidence, would be devastated when they see those reasons crumble before their eyes! They placed uncertain claims, with no evidence at all, in a place in their hearts where a man can take no less than certainty! Certainty is a necessity in the way man understands the answers he seeks to those questions! I have no problem to die skeptic about – for example – the claims of astronomers concerning the actual size of the visible universe, or the real function of an appendix in the human body! But I have every reason to worry and fear if I do not **know** with certainty what the universe is all about, and what I came

here in this world to do! This is why many stars and prosperous people in the west are seen to make the choice of committing suicide, after a long psychological struggle; right there at the very peak of their earthly success! Why? Because they know it’s short-lived! All their lives they kept muting those deep worries and doubts on the hope that perhaps when the day comes and they get everything they ever dreamed to get in this life, they will find no need to worry about them at all! But when that day eventually comes, and they have all the fame, fortune, money and power they ever dreamt of, the question becomes a load of morbidity in their empty souls! What’s next? Now that I’ve had it all, what am I supposed to do? What am I to expect? I know I can’t keep it for myself any longer than anyone who ever had it before me! I’ll start growing old like everybody else does, I’ll start **losing** what I’ve put my blood, my heart and my entire lifetime in gathering, gradually, maybe even suddenly, and painfully indeed, to go where exactly, and for what reason? And to what fate? I have done it all now, so what?

Nothing! Just devastation, emptiness, and doubt!

Uncertainty in those matters is indeed a disease that has to be cured before it’s too late!

It must be understood that the truth in questions addressed by religion is not to be known by assumption or hypothesis; it is to be received directly from its only rightful source! While assumption and hypothesis may be a plausible path to attempt research for answers to many questions about nature; it is *not* the way to acquire answers to questions about what is – by necessity of reason – beyond all nature! So intelligence and brilliance is really of no significance in regards to those questions that constitute the basis for a man’s faith in purpose, death, afterlife, and the divine! One is either holding on to the evidently ***revealed*** truth, or all that he has is myth or unverifiable theory made up by himself or by another man like himself! Ergo; the least intelligent, prosperous or famous man on earth may indeed happen to **know** the true answers to those questions that may have led some of the most brilliant and socially “elite” men ever born to kill themselves of desperation! It doesn’t take an ‘Einstein’ to know the truth, professor, it only takes a man who is true to himself and is willing to let go of the bias and just **listen**!

The professor mischievously makes the note that he should take care to keep a tape recorder installed so that when it’s time for him to die, he would leave proof that he didn’t convert before his death!

This is quite disappointing because he claims that as a “scientist” he is prepared to accept any evidence even if it proves him to be wrong! I wonder, if he were indeed honest about that, how could he be so sure that when the moment comes, he will have no reason whatsoever to even consider changing his mind? How can he be sure that it is on this particular belief that he will die, no matter how long he still has to live, and no matter what he may still come to learn in the rest of his life?

I’m amazed at how lightly he treats the issue of death as though when it is time for him to leave, he’s sure he will have had everything prepared, and will just lie there in his bed peacefully, and close his eyes with a broad smile on his face, waiting for his life to end! Is it not possible that this moment comes today, or tomorrow, when you least expect it; in bed or on board of a sinking ship or in a tremendous car crash?! Well, regardless of how it will come to find you professor, rest assured that you will see the absolute truth for yourself, with your own two eyes, there at the point of no return!

He probably wonders why many people do take the question of a deathbed confession or conversion seriously! Well, the reason is quite obvious! No matter what choices a man has come to make in his life, it is at that point in particular when he knows he’s waiting for his final moment on this Earth, that he faces a moment of truth and asks himself more seriously and honestly than ever before: “Am I on the truth? Have I really made the right choice? Am I absolutely positive that this faith I lived by in what comes to follow after death; is indeed the truth? What am I to expect, now that I’m leaving this world?” It is right then that every man who has been lying to himself and to others about the divine and about what’s there for a man to expect after death, realizes that this is his very last chance on earth! It is then that he realizes that he should have listened and acquired certain verifiable knowledge about what is coming up next for him, and not been so stubborn about it all!

Any man who may have seen the truth with its real evidence, or may – at least - have seen good reasons to question and doubt his chosen beliefs, and has been hiding the fact that deep down inside, he knew that he was wrong to live by that choice he chose for his life, and that he might indeed have wasted his life and left the truth behind, is very likely at that moment, more than ever before in his life, to express his fear, or burst out with a confession or even declare his conversion! This is true of every stubborn follower of a false questionable faith, no matter what it is! After all, he realizes at that point, that it's either now or never! And that he either knows (with evidence) or he doesn't; he can't stand anywhere in between! And that there's going to be no returning from wherever it is that he's about to go! This uncertainty, this doubt that has been hidden deep down in his heart, and has been muted by all means possible, is confronted honestly and truthfully at that moment, and for the last time in that man's life! He knows and realizes this meaning far more than ever before! No matter how arrogant a man may have lived in his life, he is indeed humbled by the seriousness of that moment! This is why confessions by a figure of fame at that moment are perhaps more significant than anything he may have ever said or done in his life!

Now I can't help commenting on certain surveys and studies the professor mentions here in attempt to study a relationship between education and "religiosity"! How can any scientist who respects himself be so "vague" about defining the variables of his experiment? I mean, what kind of religion in particular, and what kind of education in specific, are you examining the relationship in between? If you're initially assuming that "**the more educated a man gets, the less religious he becomes",** is the result you should expect regardless of what the religion is, or what the subject of education is, and no matter what other variables may have their input in the relation; you're certainly not to be called a scientist!

It is no surprise that if you teach a man a certain content of knowledge, theory, philosophy or whatever, that opposes, or at least sheds doubt over his religious beliefs; he will very likely become less religious! No surprise! So when you teach Christians that man is the descendant of hominids, and that life came about accidentally in a lake of proteins, and you keep confirming

those concepts as though they were absolute unquestionable facts; they are – naturally – expected to lose their faith! If on the other hand the education you're giving them is not secular, but adopts a religious basis, it is likely that they become more religious as they proceed with it!

It also should not be neglected that there is a plenty of other social inputs and variables that may affect a man's attitude to his religion, none of which has anything to do with the education level of the people to be surveyed!

Moreover, not all who carry a tag of Christianity (for example) are initially equal in everything they believe in Christianity, even within the same sect; and hence they will not all undergo the same impact of education on their core beliefs!

So fact of the matter is; such a study is nothing but is a monumental work of pseudoscience, even if it is performed by Michael Shermer!

Equally pseudoscientific and scholarly valueless is any study that attempts to define a particular relationship between religion and IQ level! Even though it is quite arguable that certain false beliefs and negative personal convictions may indeed affect certain aspects of intelligence negatively one way or another; there is no particular religion – no matter how mythical and futile its basic tenets may be – that may be proven statistically to impact the IQ level! I mean, what is intelligence and how do you define it in the first place? If we came to agree on the theoretical definition of what intelligence is, then perhaps we could examine what particular beliefs (religious or even secular) could impact it directly! And then of course we must not forget social, financial and psychological factors that have nothing at all to do with faith! So the assumption that we could isolate the test subject from all other impacting variables in their lives is clearly false!

This is another desperate attempt by atheists to prove the un-provable, and to twist the neck of the scientific method in favor of their blind faith, so they could at least find comfort in claiming that statistical studies support their baseless position against everything that has anything to do with religion!

At this point they may argue that they only use such statistics to draw the attention to an "indication" that this *might* be the case, they do not use it for *proof* that it actually is! And I say even this objective is valueless, because just as you have your reasons to believe that it might be an indication, we have our reasons to believe it's not! So at the end of the day, none of these statistical studies adds anything to the actual debate, and they are by all means nothing but an unfortunate waste, and a childish attempt to intimidate people of religion using the illusion of a 'scientific proof'!

On the Pascal Wager!

In this part, it is clear to me that the professor is trying to push away a dark gloom that comes along every time the idea of death floats up to his mind. He's trying to be humorous about it, probably to hide the way he truly feels deep within; but if I were him, I would've been far more humble as I address an issue as big as a potential eternity of doom for my afterlife!

The talk of probability and possibilities is so easy, now that you are still in this world, and still have a chance, isn't it? Even though one of those possibilities (or probabilities if you may) is an eternity in Hellfire!

So for a man who claims to be searching for the truth, and admits he still demands evidence to prove what religion is the true religion if any, I cannot believe how lightly he deals with this extremely serious issue! The very same arrogance by which he answered that poor girl when she asked him "*what if you're wrong*?"!

Forget about Pascal professor, and the reason he made this argument of his, take a moment of truth with yourself, take a piece of paper and write down all the possible fates that await you after death, and show some humility if you are really honest in your search for the truth!

You say that on a scale from one to seven, between (total confidence that "God" exists: 1) and (total confidence that he doesn't: 7), you are not at (7) yet, rather still at (6)! I wonder, what exactly do you expect would move you to the final level? And do you really expect that something could someday

happen that could perhaps move you down to level (4) on the middle of the scale? And what could that be? The claim that you are not confident with your position against the existence of (God), professor, is clearly nothing but an apologetic claim to make your position appear reasonable and scientific! Otherwise I cannot imagine how you assess your position at (6) not (5) or perhaps (4)! And I certainly can't imagine how different your language and your attitude would be, if indeed you were at level (7)!

I suppose every fair reader can see by the very way you wrote this book, what position you are really speaking from! As for me, I declare it in no uncertain terms that I'm standing at level one! Absolute confidence that the creator exists! It is a confidence that comes from deep understanding and acquisition of ultimately clear, reasonable and verifiable proof, not from wishful thinking, irrational philosophies under a tag of science, and "comic book" misconceptions against religion! Certainty about the evidently true answers to those major questions is a blessing that atheists can only begin to dream about!

So please do not claim that you're still searching! I will not be the first man to call you a militant atheist or a "fundamental" atheist on a call of arms for atheism now, will I?!

And after all, professor, an atheist is the one who should worry the most here; simply because he's the only one who believes (and strongly I should say) – and without a single speck of evidence – that there's nothing at all to expect after death! And that's, in a way, the essence of the Pascal wager! Of course the wager is no argument to prove the existence of God, and that's clearly not what it is about! I do not think that Pascal was trying to tell people in doubt that they'd better keep hanging on to what little faith they have because it's better than nothing! And even if indeed that's what he was doing, I do not think of it as an argument or evidence or anything as such!

Just think of it as a warning! An alarm! A reminder of the seriousness of this passing question that I'm sure should concern every atheist far more than a believer in any particular deity and in the afterlife! (Although of course it should admittedly bring every man, theist or atheist to take the question

seriously, and to examine the validity of the evidence upon which he builds his knowledge about it, before it's too late)

Ok, let's look at this (wager) from an atheist's point of view.

Applying an atheist's logic of probability (for the sake of the argument); it is known that almost all religions on Earth other than atheism (and its derivative philosophies of course) believe in some sort of continuity for the consciousness after death! This notion claims a disbeliever in any of these religions to a quite unfortunate fate (to say the least) according to its own doctrine! Thus it is clear that if a man chose to believe in a creator under whose dominion he will be judged after death, and accorded himself with one of those doctrines as the given path by that creator, he may stand some chance of making it right and surviving an unpleasant fate after death (very low probability, but a probability nonetheless)! On the other hand, given the fact that there's no argument whatsoever against the continuity of human consciousness after death, someone who believes his soul or consciousness or energy or life force or whatever it may be called will just perish entirely after death, and that there is no God at all to answer to; obviously does not stand a chance for securing himself against whatever fate that may await a blasphemer after death,: **Zero** probability!

Of course the claim that the truth is blurred and that all religions stand at different levels of *probability* of being true is false logic; I only used probabilistic reasoning here in keeping with the way atheists deal with all the big questions of life, only for the sake of the argument. What I'm saying is that if they were true to their claims about evidence, then they should give every religion they never studied or examined, at least an equal chance to Darwinism of being true! But they are not true to themselves, and they know that their estimates of probability are all grounded in nothing but their personal preferences, and they know that they have no rational argument whatsoever against creation and the existence of the creator, not to mention the overwhelming rational superiority of the Islamic belief – in particular - in the creator of heaven and Earth! So actually if I were an atheist, I say I wouldn't even sleep at night! And I definitely do not believe him when he pretends it does not worry him!

Of course it does! It has to!

I am amazed at the professor's claim that the Pascal Wager implies by necessity that a man should fake a belief even though he is not true about it or he's not convinced deep inside that it is the truth! Beliefs cannot be faked professor! You either believe or you don't!

Any holder of a false religion should not blame Pascal for this wager if he was fooled or tempted to say to himself: "Evidence or no evidence, it's better to cling to the faith of our fathers anyway than find ourselves doomed in the afterlife if what they believed was indeed the truth!" If this is what Pascal was promoting, then it is certainly unacceptable, and the question would then be: "How do you know your fathers' faith is the truth in the first place?"!

Pascal, I presume, was comparing the chances of one who believes – basically in Christianity – to those of one who does not, namely an Atheist, with no particular regard to the question of evidence on either side! Comparing a Christian (who may have no evidence for the validity of Christianity but follows a healthy human reasoning believing in the creator), to an atheist (who has no evidence against the validity of religion in general and in addition he goes against healthy human rationality denying the creator Himself): clearly the odds for the Christian position are higher! This is not to say that if based on this meaning and on this meaning alone, an atheist chose to practice religion and fake his belief, it would be acceptable or would even do him any good on Judgment day! It certainly wouldn't! Only true belief would account on that day, and in none but the true religion!

The professor then argues that the truth of whatever is there after death, might turn out to be something different from what all religions on earth believe it to be, and an atheist might as well have a chance of a glorious afterlife nonetheless! Like for instance the atheist dies to find a 'god' who – in spite of the atheist's sheer arrogance in denying everything that proves a creator to exist and to be a god of grace and perfectness – would reward him for being a good scientist or charity giver or a man with a kind heart or so forth! Now is this by any chance a rational possibility? This is nothing but

wishful thinking! Reward and punishment (by their very definition) only follow the declaration of commandment! And since there's obviously not a single stance of divine law on earth that demands people to be *good atheists* (and there couldn't possibly be such a law); no atheist could possibly be justified before the creator, whoever that creator may be! What creator could possibly accept such a grieve insult from his creatures on the day of their judgment? Not a chance!

How arrogant is Bertrand Russell when he says that if he ever comes to meet with "God" after his death he'd say: "Not enough evidence, God, not enough evidence!"! The mere proposition of it is an outrage against reason and against God! First of all, if He does exist, and He is indeed the creator, then it is only rational that He has created enough signs in the world and tools in the natural logic of man and the way he perceives the universe and everything around and within him, to make him see beyond any reasonable doubt that His existence is a necessity (which is indeed the case)! So your problem with your creator is not "lack of evidence", Mr. Russell!

Every healthy man is indeed born with the natural logic of admitting a creator and the natural urge to show gratitude to that creator and dependence on Him; so the question of why you – Mr. Russell - chose to spoil this logic and mute this urge in you is not to be answered by the claim that you lacked "evidence"! This is not a meaning that should require "evidence"! You cannot demand evidence for the natural linguistic logic that any "composition" must have been "composed" by a "composer", that any "perfectly organized system" must have a "perfect organizer", and every "law" must've been determined by a "law-giver" and "law-keeper", and that any effect must have had a cause! What evidence does any healthy man seek for the validity of his own natural axiomatic logic and the way the human mind perceives and cognates? And by what reason does he claim this meaning to apply only to small things inside the universe and not to the universe itself, even as he sees that the meaning is the same and its linguistic necessity is equally unobstructed, and has nothing to do with the analogy of ways and methods of different forms of creation? Yes of course an analogy of methods and ways is obviously wrong, but applying a meaning properly

and correctly where no other meaning could rationally be applied, is not *analogy*! It is basic human semantics! It's – simply – how humans think, speak, and assign the right words to describe what they perceive! There is no better word in human language to describe this perfect universe and its being the way we see it than "creation"! The application of this meaning to this phenomenon is true by virtue of the linguistic meaning itself! It is – in this sense – self-evident! You see something small that is composed of pieces and works as a consistent system, you automatically inquire about its maker and the purpose for which it is made! You see something big that has the same qualities, you also acknowledge it as a created system; you look at the entire universe at large and see how perfectly organized and maintained it is, with all those small things running in perfect balance inside it, you have no choice but to apply the very same meaning! The question of who the creator of this magnificent system is or what the nature of the power beyond this creation is, that's another question!

It has to be made clear to every atheist that he has no excuse to refrain from applying this natural meaning to the universe at large, on the grounds that before the universe existed, the method by which the universe itself emerged must be different from any method of creation we can observe or imagine! This fact does not render the meaning of creation itself inapplicable to the universe! Rather it proves that the creator of the universe must be un-analogous to anything in the universe, external to it and to its laws, and unquantifiable by any created tool we humans possess! If a certain event does not seem to accord with the laws of nature that we know, this doesn't make it rationally impossible! It doesn't even make it defiant to those very laws of nature by necessity, since we readily admit that we do not fully understand all there is to understand about nature!

There's also no argument against applying the meaning of creation to the universe on the grounds that it causes "infinite regress"! We have clarified that all chains of regress are only characteristic of this universe that we observe as it is, and since we do agree to the fact that the origin of the universe and the first cause must be beyond it and not part of any of the chains running within it, then He has to be the transcendent uncaused cause,

and the uncreated creator; and we have discussed that it is not at all irrational for Him not to be created, it is actually a necessity, because He is not some "complex system" of a "working composition" that we see around us that we cannot choose any better word to describe Him by but "creation"; He is not another composition (complexity) within the set of all composed things that still needs an external composer, He's by necessity not part of this chain that He created; He is beyond it! He is that one, terminal external composer!

I will argue later on in further detail on the linguistic corruption that atheism brings to the human use of language, but the point I'm making here is that; yes of course there is every reason to believe that the way we create what we create is not analogous to the way we ourselves were created, not to mention the universe; but this does not affect in any way the rational necessity of applying the ***meaning*** of creation to the universe itself! It's again the same quintessential error of mixing the analogy of an abstract **linguistic meaning** of an event or an attribute, with that of the **physical ways** by which this event or attribute takes place! This meaning is supposed to be too obvious to be questioned or to demand "evidence", regardless of how much we know or how much we think we can imagine about the way it actually took place! And yet, here's an eminent philosopher who is so disturbed that if you asked him, he might even fail to prove his very own existence!

Isn't this a pity?

So even if by this answer, Russell means to say: I – speaking of himself alone – failed to see evidence that you, God, exist; he is *lying* because every pulse in his veins and heartbeat in his chest tells him he has a creator; and he certainly has nothing at all to prove otherwise!

And after all, I have to wonder: A man who had read so much, and written so much in attack of religion, how could he possibly be excused on his judgment for not having read enough, or for not having come across the claims that holders of the true religion hold as evidence?

Well, certainly the events that will take place when he faces his creator will be much different from what he anticipated!

The professor comments, I quote:

> *"Mightn't God respect Russell for his courageous skepticism (let alone for the courageous pacifism that landed him in prison in the First World War) far more than he would respect Pascal for his cowardly bet-hedging?"* (Dawkins, p.104)

I say: All those who have seen the truth, heard the call to it and have been subjected to its clear evidence, will have no excuse before the Lord when they reject it (and actually fight it the way Russell did), no matter what they choose to believe in its place!

Forget about Russell's answer professor, and prepare your own, for every man will be judged alone! Here are a few questions I'd make sure not to die before I have prepared my own reasonable answer to, if I were you:

"By what reason or proof did you choose to deny His existence, when you know that reason necessitates it, and everything around you and within you tells you clearly that He must exist?"

"How did you dare take this militant attitude towards all religions and take that for a cause to fight for, with so little and so feeble knowledge you ever gathered about any of those religions?"

"How could you judge a religion by the claims and writings of its enemies, without even caring to consult its own established scholars on how its texts are properly understood and on what evidence they rely in that understanding they hold?"

"By what reason could you take the clear contradictions and corruptions in Christian texts to be evidence for the corruption of *all* texts on earth that are also ascribed to Him as scripture?"

"By what reason did you choose to neglect the perfect attributes and the consistent and coherent faith in the Lord that is described in the message of Muhammad, based on empty accusations from haters and people who don't know what they're talking about?"

"On what basis did you choose to judge certain rulings in certain religions as unfair or unjust, when the very moral code you apply and upon which your society stands is only a mix of the remains of scattered religious moralities in addition to some secular theoretical propositions that only came from the minds of limited humans like yourself? And if you wanted to judge by instinctual (natural) moralities; whose instincts would you label "perfectly correct" and on what evidence? By what right then do you allow yourself to judge what is moral and what is not, on the basis of some manmade social standards you chose to accept and live by, the origin of many of which you may not even know? Kant, Bentham, Nietzsche, Marx, Sartre and others, are all but limited humans like yourself who had their guesses on what morality means, so by what right did you take their theories for a standard to judge what is argued to be the Lord's own laws, moral codes and commandments?"

I thereby call unto every stubborn atheist to let go of his arrogance before it's too late, and to desist from making false judgments as though he knows all there is to know when in fact he doesn't; listen and learn and be true to yourself as you do, and by all means **be worried** about dying on those choices you have made! And if the whole issue is no big deal to you, and you're willing to go to your grave with those beliefs and a cold smile on your face; then by all means do not try to get other people infected by your senselessness!

The professor then makes a final comment on the wager, attempting an anti-wager; he says:

> *"Suppose we grant that there is indeed some small chance that God exists. Nevertheless, it could be said that you will lead a better, fuller life if you bet on his not existing, than if you bet on his existing and therefore squander your precious time on worshipping him, sacrificing to him, fighting and dying for him, etc."* (Dawkins, p. 105)

"Suppose we grant that there is indeed some small chance that God exists"? Interesting! I thought you already accepted that there is some little probability that He exists! How come then you ask me now, for the sake of the argument, to '*suppose*' that there is that small chance? Level (6) or level

(7) now, professor? I do urge my respectable reader to pinpoint this clear inconsistency in the professor's position!

Listen to him when he says: "It could be said that you will lead a better, fuller life if you bet on his not existing…" Well, no it couldn't! Not in all religions anyway! This certainly depends on the kind of religion we're talking about! If indeed it is the evidently true religion that we're talking about, the will of the true creator, the one who made man and knows best what he can and cannot do, what gives him happiness, fullness and self-satisfaction and what doesn't, then it certainly **could not** be said that life without this religion is better! Now regardless of what religion I'm arguing for: this is simple reason I'm applying here, not blind faith!

If indeed you're following the true will of your creator, then you're on the right path; by all means a winner, both in this life and in the next one! If not, then no matter what you do, it's bitter waste of a limited lifetime in a limited mortal world, one that proceeds steadily to an inevitable end, after which is an eternity that you will have wasted altogether, no matter how much "fun" you've had in this dark house of mortality! So what "waste" are you talking about?

Well, that's what atheism is really all about now, isn't it? Atheists are people who simply **do not wish** to '*waste their precious time*' submitting to their maker, worshipping and abiding by His will whatever it may be! And it will become clearer as we proceed with this literature, that it's not a question of reason or evidence at all! It's a **philosophy of denial,** brilliantly forged for the sole purpose of alleviating cognitive dissonance, by justifying the personal denial of the undeniable, fueled by a deep desire to live free from any form of commitment to a supreme unquestionable lawgiver that would judge every man for every little decision that he makes in his life! It's nothing but a psychological defense strategy against the meaning of submission that the very concept of such a being forces down upon humans! Liberalism, thus, is the core principle of atheism; the engine of motivation that blocks out all rational argumentation for the truth in their hearts, no matter how A-priori or self-evident those arguments may be! They just **have** to deny… it's the only way!

On the Bayesian arguments

All in all, I agree with the professor that this is certainly not an argument! There is no *equation* of mathematics that could prove the existence of "God" – or disprove it for that matter - any more than prove or disprove – for example – the existence of the human mind itself! And if the professor is one way or another, waiting on the hope that perhaps one day a Cosmologist or a physicist or a mathematician could come up with a theorem that "proves the existence of God", he's fooling himself, and I'm afraid he's going to wait forever! This is quite simply not what mathematics is "made" for! So I will not bother examine his refutation of this argument, for he clearly makes a good point there!

However, I find myself compelled to comment on this statement:

> *"On the other hand, Unwin thinks the existence of evil, especially natural catastrophes such as earthquakes and tsunamis, counts strongly against the likelihood that God exists. Here, Unwin's judgment is opposite to mine but goes along with many uncomfortable theologians. 'Theodicy' (the vindication of divine providence in the face of the existence of evil) keeps theologians awake at night. The authoritative Oxford Companion to Philosophy gives the problem of evil as 'the most powerful objection to traditional theism'. But it is an argument only against the existence of a good God. Goodness is no part of the definition of the God Hypothesis, merely a desirable add-on."*

Again, an argument from ignorance! The problem of "evil" in the world is – as shall be elaborated in later sections - exclusively a problem in Christianity! This is simply because among much of the heavenly knowledge they lost and manipulated, they wasted scripture that could explain the necessity and purpose of creation of evil in the world! And since they forged a particular image of "God" that is not true, and they even forged scripture to support it, (take John 3:16 for a clear example) [12] they

[12] Note that when I say "Forged scripture" I'm not by necessity accusing "John" for example of writing what he wrote and claiming it unto God! He probably didn't! The man just wrote down his own narrative of stories he heard, in the light of his own beliefs, which were later piled up, given the seal of divinity and canonized as the "word of God"!

can no longer explain evil in a manner that goes consistently with the core of the Christian Creed (The God of unconditional love)! Hence you get the famous escape argument: “God works in mysterious ways”! They simply don’t know!

The answer to this problem that ‘keeps theologians awake at night’ is only to be found in a complete content of heavenly knowledge and wisdom that is there to teach a man what exactly he is supposed to do and how to deal with every impact – positive or negative - of this world on his life! Let it be clear, my respectable reader, that the question of why there is “evil” in the world under authority of a perfect creator, is just like the question: Why does there have to be death in the world; cannot be answered by philosophical hypothesis, nor can it be answered in a lab! It has to be delivered and explained in clear scripture that is evidently the Lord’s own!

Only the creator of the world can tell you why there has to be so many things in the world that you do not like, and how you are supposed to deal with them! So if we are to obtain any answer to such questions, we first have to identify the right authority of knowledge thereof! The right way to seek those answers is not to make them up as theory of philosophy; the truth on those issues is not to be invented or hypothesized: it is to be **obtained**! An honest seeker of the truth in answer to such questions should only be searching for a body of scripture that is indeed what it claims to be: the word of God! Clearly we, humans, need the creator Himself to tell us why He made us, and why He made the world this way, and what exactly – in fair detail - we’re supposed to do with it! The search for the truth thus should only be the search for what scripture is indeed the message of the creator, the Supreme Being to which reason necessitates all attributes of perfectness!

So, if a legacy of scripture in any religion lacks this explicit answer, or puts it in an unclear, irrational, or incomprehensible manner, or a manner that lacks a perfectly rational consistency with all necessary attributes of the Lord, then that scripture is evidently **not** the word of God or of any of His prophets! The creator of man will not do him injustice by asking him to comprehend something that is beyond a simple man’s thinking, as a

prerequisite for this man's redemption! After all, the majority of students around Jesus were just simple fishermen and tax collectors, weren't they? They were not Greek philosophers or church theologians!

In the Quran, the purpose of creation of good and bad is explained as simply and clearly and consistently with all attributes of perfectness of the Lord as in no other book of scripture that now exists on Earth! Just read this verse for example:

((Every soul must taste death, and We test you with evil and with good, for ordeal. And to Us you will be returned.)) (Translation of the Qur'an verse (21|35))

Just watch how elegantly, simply and conclusively the purpose of creation of both good and bad in this world is explained in the clear words of the creator! All life, with everything in it, good and bad, is but a test for man, so that he makes choices for which he shall be judged on a day of "return", which in turn justifies death! End of story! Pure and simple! The meaning of 'choice' and consequentially 'evil', is problematic only to a theology that presupposes the belief in a dramatic act that was made by God at a certain point in history, to bestow unconditional love and forgiveness upon humans, with no regards whatsoever to their deeds or their choices! This theology is false, and this is exactly why it keeps them up at night!

In this verse from the Quran, we can see the purpose of life, death, good, evil, pain, catastrophe, war, disease…. etc., explained in a single eloquent verse! Of course, this is not the only verse that deals with this issue; I just put it here as example. I only wish my reader could read it in Arabic, in its original tongue, to sense the richness, the power and the magnificence of the way the Lord addresses His creatures in the Quran!

I shall further elaborate in another section on this meaning to answer to some relevant misconceptions, and to show that there is indeed elaborate teaching on what exactly man should do with respect to disease, evil, war, and so forth, to pass the test of life! The reason I quote this verse in this context here is not to offer the explanation of good and evil in the Qur'an and the way it goes in perfect coherence with all Attributes of perfectness of Allah, I

only wanted to offer the reader an example of how simply and clearly a book that is ascribed to the creator and claims to be the word of "God" should answer to such a fundamental question of meaning and purpose! A sane man should expect no less of a book that is ascribed to the omniscient all-wise creator Himself!

So again my kind reader I repeat: Problems with a certain religion and its scripture are problems only with that religion in particular! They are not to be stretched out to encompass all scripture and all religion, and ultimately, they are not to be used as arguments against the existence of the creator! As I shall elaborate in another part of this literature, the clear spread of superstition and pseudoscience against all forms of proper rational thinking in today's Western society – or any other society - is not the natural result of any faith or any religious belief as claimed by the professor; it is particularly the outcome or influence of any form of false belief system (especially the pagan (wisdom) of eastern religions like Hinduism and Buddhism!), atheism included!

This is no surprise! After all, a false religion or belief system is itself a highly revered and hallowed structure of myth and fallacy, which stands in the most part on no reliable evidence whatsoever! The further away a society gets with its religious beliefs from the truth in the direction of paganism ("shirk" in Muslim Jargon), the more they are inclined to believing baseless superstition, branching from their already baseless belief systems! One can see that for example, a society where the core religion has gone with paganism to as far as worshipping virtually everything in the universe, and taking millions of things for gods, would find no problem in grasping every mystical claim in the metaphysical, without any evidence whatsoever! Just tell a pagan that there's say X energy in this room, and if you contemplate long enough you will sense it, and there you go: you create a believer in X energy! This inclination is an extreme, the opposite of which at the other end is atheism! Both extremes are indeed anti-reason! And as I shall elaborate, both extremes open a man for myth and nonsense, only under different tags and of different nature!

While pagans are prepared (stemming from irrational tenets of faith) to believe and readily accept any claim about a spiritual supernatural without any verifiable evidence, atheists on the other hand – whose core philosophy was actually nothing but a natural historical reaction to paganism (spiritualism Vs. materialism) – have chosen to dismiss every metaphysical claim or belief in the supernatural, assuming that this pagan nonsense they see around them is the only way humans approach questions of the spiritual and of what's beyond! They were – and understandably so – tempted by the nature of blind "faith" and false "religion" they saw in their societies, to dismiss all ancient religions and faith in God altogether and stretch the tag of superstition and irrational thinking to cover it all! However, this attitude is every bit as irrational and fundamentally false and extremist, as the pagan conception of the deity to which it was a natural reaction! There are those who say everything is god or god is everywhere, and those who say nothing is god and god is nowhere! Both are irrational extremes, and the truth is to be found in none of them! Both parties have no evidence to support their position, both sides create evidence from delusion and irrational thinking, and they both have gone too far in denying what may be right and true in what the opposite group may have! The only place where you should expect to find a perfect rational balance between the material and the spiritual, the physical and the metaphysical, is in the only true body of wisdom and knowledge that is delivered from the creator himself! Only in a verifiably divine body of knowledge is this wisdom to be found!

So while on one hand you have irrational followers of blind faith who believe in false gods, and even view everything in the world to be "God", you have on the other hand irrational followers of blind faith in a world with no creator at all, and a total denial of everything divine; both "faiths" rely on pseudoscience and propagate it! A pseudoscience may simply be defined as a "science" that builds on a radically false philosophy! So just like astrology and is an example of pagan pseudoscience, abiogenesis– at the other extreme – is an example of an atheist pseudoscience! Both 'sciences' stem from false philosophy.

The point is; atheists must understand that we – Muslims - do share their attitude and sentiment towards every baseless irrational superstition that is spread around only because it is said to have been a form of ancient wisdom, or something of the sort, when it is nothing but the work of some arrogant philosopher or storyteller of old who was made into a god or a false prophet! In fact, our position against it is much stricter and far more serious than atheists could ever be! It is part of the wisdom we evidently received from the creator, to save humanity from all forms of superstition and falsehood! And while atheists would never observe a law to keep such fallacies from damaging the knowledge and beliefs of commoners and laypeople, Islamic Sharee'a law on the other hand places the purification and safekeeping of people's knowledge among its basic ideals. It's our noble mission! It is exactly why the concept of the Muslim nation and the work to spread Islam, is a core concept in the Muslim thinking! Because the way this nation is built, and the way it is assigned to spread the Lordly wisdom over the face of the earth, is indeed part of what this final message of mercy to humanity is all about!

So as much as I sympathize and join forces with intellectual leaders of science in the west in their war against superstition and irrationality, I absolutely detest their blind generalizations and assumptions that all religion is superstition and that all faith is blind! There is somewhere in the middle where true wisdom and the only truly rational position is expected to be found, and this is where you will find Islam! Only in the words of the ONE source of both, nature and reason; material and the wisdom behind it, the here, the beyond, and the hereafter, is the correct human position towards the whole thing to be found! Not in the teachings of a priest or a Guru or a philosopher that bears nothing unto evidence; and not in the speculations and desperate irrational attempts of a scientist who has overestimated his methods and was deluded to see evidence where there's none at all, but in the evidently true teachings of the creator Himself!

Those people of science, who wage intellectual wars for the sake of reason and rationality, would admit repeatedly that there are indeed questions that cannot be answered by "science"! So where on earth do they expect to find

their answer? Very often you'd hear professor Dawkins say: 'I know that science cannot answer those questions but I don't think there's any reason to believe that religion can either!' And thus I find myself compelled to comment: 'Well then, will you please do us the courtesy of proving the validity of this ultimate generalization that you so easily declare about all 'religion', professor? Or should we just take your word for it, because you're an oxford professor of Zoology?'! And now what do you atheists suggest? That we just make up any answer and go to our graves with it, to somehow mute that urge deep within? Or simply throw it all behind and proceed with eating, drinking, reproducing, in total abandon, in submission to our flesh, and use science to have as much fun as we can, and burn out a meaningless lifetime like the intelligent "apes" you believe us to be?

In their campaign against irrationality and pseudoscience, people like Dawkins, Shermer, Randi, and others do indeed hit quite a lot of truth and expose a great deal of fakery and fallacy for what it really is, and they are to be credited for that! But when they take a position in testing people's claims that is much like looking in a telescope and saying: "since I can't see any God out there; then there can't be any!"; this is where they are certainly, and by all means of reason and rationality: **wrong**! And whatever method they apply at that; is every bit a form of pseudoscience!

Silly objections to creation

Here's a few silly objections that may commonly be used by atheists in their literature against God's existence and His creation of the universe.

Why not earlier? Why not later?

> *"If God created the universe, then God existed before the universe did. That's okay with us, but why then did God create the universe at the time He did? Why not earlier, or later?"*

And the answer from any decent self-respecting man who understands his limits and the grandeur of the eternal creator we are talking about here should be nothing other than this: "**It's none of your bloody business"!** The

question comes from the pagan imagery they hold of the creator which insists on limiting Him to the likeness of a human being! They insist on thinking of Him as part of the chain of regress of causes! They need to get it into their heads that we are talking about an ETERNAL creator that had no beginning, and has no end! If you could imagine a single point of reference in the scope of existence of such a being to which you could relate this or that event and thus wonder why He didn't do it any earlier, then your question may make some sense! But there is no such a reference of time to which He is to be bound like we are! We only understand time through our created universe! And when He tells us in His book about events that took place fifty thousand years before the creation of the universe – for example – this is the creator of our understanding of time, giving us a measure of time that we can understand through the only frame of reference that we can think of when we measure time! God is not some old man who is to be asked – for example: "why did you create this universe at this point of your "life" not when you were younger or older" for example! Praised be His almighty self!

It needs to be established that certain questions are not to be asked! Not only because they could not be answered by any knowledge we could possibly afford, and not only because the question itself may not make any sense at all (like this silly question here), but because it is simply **wrong** to ask them! It is irrelevant to what we are here to do! We should observe humility with our creator and only ask about what we really **need** to know; and we should expect that only in His complete revelation would we find such an answer if indeed we needed it for the purpose of our creation! Wisdom is to know the right question to ask, and what to do with its answer!

We only know about Him what He tells us, and we need not be told why He chose to create the world and test us within it in the first place! Questions like: Why did God choose to create anything at all, why not leave us in nothingness? Why did He choose to create us as tested beings in the world, not in any other way? Why did He choose to tell us to worship Him in this way not in another? Why does He demand anything or anybody to worship Him at all? We just shouldn't be asking such questions! We have no right to ask them, and we obviously have no purpose in their answers!

I mean what would you make of this question: “Why did God create the universe in six days rather than six hours, or six years?”? To me this is nothing but the insolence of a blind heart! I mean suppose God did choose to create the universe in six years, would that make you more satisfied with creation and more willing to accept the truth? No! You would then ask: “But why not in six days?”! And you would keep posing all sorts of silly objections! This is because in reality **you do not wish** to accept the idea of a creator choosing to create anything at all, in the first place!

What difference does it make to you, six days or six weeks or six minutes? What difference does it make to you, the limited creature, why He chose to do X rather than Y when He could choose to do Y if He so willed? If He – the only source of knowledge for why He did this and that, rather than anything else – doesn’t teach us in His revelation the reason why He made a certain choice; then it’s not something that we need to know, and if this is the case, then we should dismiss such a question altogether! Never forget your place in this universe, and who exactly it is that you are talking about here!

Translation of the Qur’an (21|23): ***((He will not (and is not to) be questioned as to that which He does, but they (humans) will be questioned.))***

As limited creatures we came to find ourselves restricted to this world, and thus we needed to inquire about the reason why we are here and what we are supposed to do, and that’s exactly what the creator tells us in His revealed messages! If it was of any significance for us to know what exactly He may have created before the universe (which is a timescale that stretches all the way back to eternity!), when and why, or what He may create after the universe, He would tell us about that! It’s absolutely presumptuous to claim that since we cannot know on our own or from His teaching what exactly He may have been doing a billion years before He created the universe – for example; then the answer that He created us is not logically sufficient!

Some atheists would say: "*The problem of what caused God to create the Universe pretty much means that there were other things going on before God created the universe and this is a contradiction*!"

What contradiction? We never said that it is rationally necessary that this universe came to be from nothing! We never said that it is rationally necessary that God never created anything before the Universe! It's not! And in fact there are narratives of authentic Hadith that tell us that there was indeed a different form of creation before the universe! You wish to learn about that, there's only one way to obtain this knowledge: The teachings of a true messenger of God!

The act of creation of the universe is so unique and un-analogous to any event that may take place within it (which is what makes all the difference to our human tool of analogy), not because the universe was created from nothing, but because it was created the way it is, period! Whatever was there before its creation and whatever the initial substance from which it was created; it is by all means unimaginable by any means of human analogy! We have no rational problem with that! We also have no rational problem with the fact that God should be able to create from nothingness, because otherwise, the essential meaning of the first cause would obviously fail! Creation by re-composition (creating something from something else) is a restriction that is forced upon humans' crafts in this universe; it is not to be proposed that such restriction applies to the creator of all creation, because if it did, then He would not be the creator of all creation, would he?

Following the track of this objection is this argument:

> *"If God is all-knowing, then the instant God was conscious it would have known all the pros and cons of creating a Universe and knew that it was going to do it. Therefore there is no reason for God to wait. If God chooses to wait then what is the reason?... there must be a reason. This reason, to cause God to wait, would be a limit on his omnipotence."*

I cannot dignify this nonsense with a response!

Here's another silly objection:

> *"God cannot have created Time! In order for time to be created it must be finite, which of course it can't be, because the creation of time must have occurred before time, which is not possible."*

Now hold it right there! What is your definition of time in the first place? If by time you mean the measure of sequential events that are done by the creator relative to one another, then this is certainly not finite and it is not something that was ever *created*! It's external to our human notion of time! Because by time we commonly mean the measure of created events within this universe in reference to a standard constant motion of celestial bodies around us (i.e. the sun and the moon)! This is what God created, and this is what anybody may mean when he says that God created time and that time is finite! But this created time does not confine the creator, and in reality, outside this closed system of the universe through which we understand time; God's time has no start and no end and is not created!

> *"Everything must have a cause therefore God exists.*
>
> *This statement is sometimes used as argument that there must be a god. But, it doesn't work. Because if god was not created by something, then god exists without a cause. And therefore the argument is "Everything except god must have a cause". If this argument is valid then it must also be valid to say "Everything except the Universe must have a cause".*

The same "infinite regress" objection but in a silly costume! The right argument to put is this: Everything that follows the rules of the Universe as we observe it; must have a cause! Those rules are – by necessity - caused and enforced by an external agent. This agent may itself be governed and restricted by the rules of another agent; but this only makes the first another part of the system that had to be created and run (caused) by the latter! This regress of causes has to end at one transcendent being that is not created or restricted by any superior power; and thus God must be uncaused; not the universe! The regress has – as a necessity of reason - to end at a being that is beyond the chain!

Now listen to this one:

> *"There are fewer unanswered questions if we discard the idea of God. "*

Oh so this makes it *reasonable* that we do discard it? Who said that any answer that poses more questions should not be accepted as the truth? What have you people ever learnt from science itself anyway? Quantum physics raises more questions than answers, doesn't it? So perhaps you should not bother studying it at all then!

Here's a common objection:

> *"If God was really there and His evidence is irrefutable, then why are we debating about Him now? Why doesn't He show us with direct observation that He exists, like say He opens up the sky and lets us see Him directly?"*

Well, first of all the fact that we are debating about Him doesn't by any means make the evidence for His existence "refutable"! Many philosophers find it a privilege to question absolutely everything even reality itself, even their own existence! Does this make such debates "rational" or in any way "plausible" to any sensible man? Does the fact that some people debate the meaning of the truth – for example – undermine this meaning in any way? If it does then what is the purpose of that debate itself anyway? I mean even that shining ball in the middle of the sky that we all call the sun, is indeed questionable to many deranged philosophers, and you may easily find a debate running somewhere in the world between somebody who believes the sun – among the rest of what we observe around us – to be a real tangible object that exists in (the outside world) apart from our consciousness on one hand, and somebody who thinks that there is no such a thing as reality, and that it's all just the illusion created in our minds by effect of sensory brain signals, on the other (an idealist philosopher)! I mean who knows, after all we might all be slaves living in a virtual reality world that fools us into believing that there is a world around us, or we're sleeping motionless right now in a "Matrix" that feeds "reality" to our brains so we would continue to live in oblivion, unaware of the Machines that are sucking energy from our

bodies (talk to the Wachowski brothers and they may actually have you convinced!)![13] This monumental nonsense is indeed in debate among humans who are very proud of their minds and of their rationality! So it is obvious that the way the world is made, and the way that we are made allows for humans to go – in stubborn belief in their fallacies – to as far as denying the input of their very own senses! Why? Because that's what the world is created for: The ongoing conflict and debate between truth and fallacy in different choices that people make! We are here to be tested by one another, and the test is a test of faith! The choice of faith and the life you choose to live by that faith is what this whole world is all about!

This is precisely why Allah wouldn't end this debate in this silly way that atheists may desire so that they would finally admit what their innate reason tells them is the truth! He's not going to reveal Himself finally for the whole world to see in some universal event that leaves no choice for any human being but to bow in total submission and fear; never before the end times! Why? Because there would be no point at all in continuing to live in a mortal world that works in this particular way, if the Lord would do something like that! It would be the universal end of the test; the very thing that justifies its continuing to be the way that it is!

The way this question is put, it is obviously one that should only be addressed to God Himself, isn't it? I mean it is He who tells us why we are here, and accordingly why the world has to be the way that it is, including the essential question of why He doesn't give us some universally fearful

[13] Some particular sects of Sufism and mysticism really believe that the world that we observe around us is not at all real, and that the only real thing in existence is God! This is a branch of pantheistic and pagan idealistic philosophies that unfortunately had its dominion over many deranged people who were observed by their ignorant followers as great scholars of Islam, even though they actually suffered profound ignorance and deviation from Islam, like (Ibn-'Arabi) and others! This is the kind of nonsense no sane man should even need to refute! Because if I'm really going to question the input that my very senses give me; then not only should I have any reason to believe in God Himself, or His prophets or any miracles of any kind, I will have no reason to believe that I myself exist! I mean the easiest argument to put against this nonsense is this: If everything around you is nothing but an illusion, then it follows that your prophet is an illusion, your holy book is an illusion, and God himself is an illusion; otherwise how could you make any distinction whatsoever between what is real and what is not? An *Angel* is talking to you? How do you trust that this is not in itself an illusion? It is most unfortunate indeed that this pantheistic blasphemy (Wahdatul Wujud وحدة الوجود) especially in the teachings of Ibn 'Arabi enjoys wide popularity as Islamic faith in the West in our times!

sign to end all debate and settle all conflict about this crucial issue, and get all humans to submit once and for all!

And when you consult the one true book of the creator about this matter, and ask Him why He doesn't reveal Himself or a mighty angel and give us this one universal sign that would end all debate; you get this answer:

Translation of the Qur'an (6|8): ***((They say: Why has not an angel been sent down unto him? If We sent down an angel, then the matter would be judged; no further time would be given them.))*** (i.e. Why do we not see a great universal sign with Muhammad that gets the whole world to drop to their knees in belief?)

Translation (26|4) ***((If We so will, We can send down on them from the sky a portent so that their necks would remain bowed before it.))***

But that's not His will! That's not why we all have to continue to live in this world until we leave it in our appointed times! The test still continues and the world still has more time to go! And in all cases they are indeed lying to themselves when they demand such a sign from the sky that would scare them all into immanent submission, because a sane and honest man really needs not do anything more than just take a look at the sky as it is, to see the grandeur of the creator, if indeed he was true to himself!

If God willed to have all humans down on their knees instantly he would indeed do it, but mortal life on this Earth was not created for this purpose! It was created to have people choose freely what to believe and to take full responsibility for their informed choices! So if a man insists on denying God when everything around him and inside him tells him that His existence is a necessity and that submission to Him is a rational consequence; then nothing would make him let go of this stubborn denial he has chosen in this life, unless he really saw the angels splitting the sky apart forcing him to bow down, and the world was taken over by such universal events; and this my kind reader, because of the very wisdom and purpose for which the world was creator, is not to take place before the End Times, the appointed time for the end of the test! Because when it does happen, and the sky does spilt asunder, the very purpose of faith in God would be terminated, since then

nobody would have any more choice to deny and argue freely for his position as he wishes, or to accept the truth after its arguments had been made clear; and it would be too late to regret a lifetime of stubborn denial and disbelief! So either the atheist lets go of his arrogance and accepts the clear truth and quits making silly objections and demanding things that would terminate the very reason for which we are here; or he just waits like all humans have to wait, for the time when the Angel of Death eventually comes to take him and he sees with his own eyes what he spent his entire lifetime denying fervently and challenging despite all necessities of human reason!

Well; enough of this childish whining for now! I think my reader has got the picture of what is really going on in those people's hearts! It's a real humiliation that one would even bother to carry on arguing with such nonsense!

(I came across those "entertaining arguments" – except for the last one - on the webpage of some poor "satanic" guy, I quoted them here only to show you how pathetically insolent and vacuous objections to creation and to the existence of God could get:

http://www.vexen.co.uk/religion/universe.html#Possible)

Chapter Two

Answering Chapter four of the delusion:

Why there almost certainly is no God

In this chapter, Dawkins goes way too far in his desperate campaign against the existence of the creator! But for someone who defies human reason itself and battles to turn it upside-down; nowhere is too far! It is no surprise then how he applies rules of mathematical probability in attempt to achieve proof, and actually feels comfortable with calling that attempt "near certainty"! So what is probability, and what kind of knowledge do we obtain from probabilistic reasoning?"

The delusion of improbability!

In this section of the "Delusion", Dawkins attempts to refute what he calls the argument from improbability! It's sad actually because there is no such a thing as "argument" from improbability in the first place! This is a typical case of (attacking straw men), because it is obviously not by means of probability that we prove the existence of God! And those who applied probability and improbability in either sides of the debate, were apparently unaware of the true meaning and rationale of probability and what it really means, as we shall elaborate here.

Dawkins says:

> *'Hoyle said that the probability of life originating on Earth is no greater than the chance that a hurricane, sweeping through a scrapyard, would have the luck to assemble a Boeing 747. Others have borrowed the metaphor to refer to the later evolution of complex living bodies, where it has a spurious plausibility. The odds against assembling a fully functioning horse, beetle or ostrich by randomly shuffling its parts are up there in 747 territory.'*

Now the first problem I observe with many scientists in their discourse when dealing with the question of probability is that they very often mix it up in meaning and value with "possibility"! Something may be extremely unlikely, and improbable, but is nonetheless possible! The distinction between those two meanings has to be made very clear!

Furthermore; when I say it is improbable that event X takes place, what this statement really means is that due to **my experience with many similar cases** to this particular case, and due to my observation that in the greatest majority of those cases, event X did not take place, I conclude that the chance that event X would take place this time, is very little! Still, what does this really mean? Does it mean that X could not possibly take place? Does it mean that it is *impossible*? No! It simply means that I – only a limited observer who doesn't know, and who is simply trying to figure out a certain pattern in those similar events by which we could acquire a common rule –

do not know, but I *have some reason not to expect* that event X will take place!

Probability really means no more than that!

It is the statement of an inherently limited human observer who analogizes similar cases, and tries to make an expectation of what may happen in a certain case, *considering a review of similar previous cases*! This uninformed guessing, in concept, is not wrong; it's in fact very useful to us, but only when applied in its right place and for the right purpose! Had this observer acquired an inclusive formula or rule, validated by examining all variables and causes related to the case in question, he would not have resorted to probability! He would've made a statement of fact! When I add an amount of acid to an amount of alkali, I do not say it's *probable* that the outcome will be salt and water! I do not use probability here (even though anomalies are rationally possible in principle)! The phenomenon is thoroughly studied, all variables are known and the resultant is not subject to probabilistic estimates! When a fish is thrown out of the water, I know it will die! I do not say 'it is improbable or highly improbable that it may live'! I know it will not live! But when on the other hand, I have a man who has cancer, in a very deteriorated state, and the majority of cases that I saw who came to that condition, died in a few months time or so, I can only say that it is *improbable* that he may live! I cannot say in certainty or near certainty that he will die! Why? Because I do not know all the variables and causes in action here; I cannot determine a rule or law that says this man will certainly die within a particular span of time! Nobody can!

This is why when he does survive eventually, at odds of one to a hundred thousand or a million; people tend to call this a Miracle! Because that's exactly what a miracle is! It's an event - not by necessity supernatural (whichever way you define this term) - that defies expectations and betrays most common observations known to man! If a group of people are well established in practice of a certain craft (say carpentry), and have never seen a carpenter capable of finishing the construction of a wooden cupboard in less than two days, are met with a man who can do the job in only two minutes or even two hours; they call that a miracle! This is why the Arabic

word for Miracle is (Mu'jiza معجزة) which translates: Something that challenges people's power and knowledge (leaving them incapable of mimicking it)! Scholars define it as (the breaching of the common case خرق العادة)! It does not mean an *impossible* event! That is, it is not something that the mind finds impossible! It's simply the occurrence of something that the mind fails to explain by means of any currently known analogy!

Perhaps among the reasons for this ambiguity in dealing with high improbabilities as compared to impossibilities, is the lack of clarity in common scientific thought in the distinction between physical (statistical) impossibility, and rational impossibility! For example, when we say that it is impossible for a ball to free-fall upwards rather than downwards (according to the laws of gravity), we are talking about physical impossibility, which may in fact be described as an extreme case of improbability (a figure with so many zeroes it can hardly be conceived of)! So it is treated as impossibility, just as it is the case in mathematics in general when extremely small quantities are rendered (negligible). Another example of this is the known fact of physics that it is impossible for a man to walk through a wall (as a definitive property of the solid state). This is physical impossibility, but it's not a rational impossibility such that we couldn't possibly believe it if it was said to happen one day! We now know that atoms in any solid matter are vastly interspaced in a manner that makes it clear that what keeps us from merging with a wall when we touch it, or from sinking in solid ground, is actually an interplay of forces and energies that bind those atoms, forces that could – at least in the realm of rational possibility – be manipulated! Now as unbelievably improbable this phenomenon really is, it is not rationally impossible!

However, when we say on the other hand that one object cannot exist in two places at the same time, or one object cannot be three objects at the same time; we are stating a rational impossibility! It cannot be expressed in terms of probabilistic estimation, because such a thing just cannot possibly happen! And thus we can see that if something is statistically impossible, it's not by necessity rationally impossible, whereas rational impossibilities are senseless from the very onset of linguistic expression itself; they do not

stand a chance of moving into the realm of physical, statistical and probabilistic assessment! It may indeed happen – against all odds – that I witness a ball falling upwards rather than downwards one day, or that I actually walk through a wall; it's not rationally impossible! But there's no way on Earth that I could ever expect to one day meet with another (me) (for example), or take a journey to (nonexistence), or go back in time to change history!

This is why we say that when we fail to find a "scientific explanation" to a certain event, we do not conclude that it has no rational explanation! A rational explanation is not by necessity "*scientific*", statistical or mathematical! Only materialists (who believe that what they can see is all there can be) suffer this sickness of the mind! By "scientific" they mean an explanation that comes only from the very little that we currently know from observation (empirically) - or can attempt to understand by means of analogy to the empirically observed or experimented - about the laws of the universe and the way things work in it! This materialistic rule on what explanation is to be called rational and what is not - and hence what event is to be described as rationally possible and what is not - is in itself irrational and by all means anti-knowledge! By scientific explanation they only mean an explanation that is bound to our current tool of examination and theorization (the scientific method); and quite obviously, only very little of the way the world itself runs as we see it – in its ordinary state – do we really possess any form of 'scientific' knowledge about! The very meaning of what is ordinary about the world and what is extraordinary, what is natural and what is supernatural, is a statement of **limited** human knowledge! When we describe something as "natural" we simply mean that we are *used* to seeing it this way in nature!

So if you can't *explain* it today, this doesn't make it unexplainable tomorrow, and if no man will ever be capable of explaining it at all in the future, this doesn't make it rationally impossible!

We must admit that there should always be things beyond our human ability to understand, even in this universe itself as we see it. This is not to tell man to quit learning about the universe, of course not; but to learn how to put his

mind in its proper size, to learn how to be humble in his personal faith, and to recognize the natural limits of his tools! Just as we can observe the existence of the mathematical infinity in numbers, and understand that no matter how much we could count, there is no approaching that value; we can also understand that it is only rational that no matter how much about the universe we learn, it will always be very little! There will always be events and phenomena that do not fall within the range of any humanly achievable knowledge! This is by no means an appeal to ignorance, but to self-respect and humility! It is not ignorance as long as we know – with reliable evidence – where to draw the line.

Among those things that we understand, accept and even find it rationally necessary that there is no way we could understand or imagine; is of course the way the creator Himself is, and the way He does what He does! This is not the infinity value; this is what is there *beyond* the infinity value! Something we know is there by necessity of reason, but not only do we recognize it as unreachable for our knowledge; we actually recognize the rational necessity of its being this way: out of any line of analogy or knowledge our minds can possibly contain!

There were cases in history when the creator intended to make people see an event that leaves them unable to give it any causal explanation other than recognizing it as the exceptional work of the creator Himself, for the purpose of supporting the cause of His messengers and prophets.

So if we argue that among those miracles were events that are not only external to the knowledge of the people of the time, but to all human knowledge and comprehension, does this mean that such an event must have been in the sense that the order of the universe was interrupted by it? No! The universe is one big system ordered and controlled entirely by its creator! So no matter how exceptional an event is made by the Lord to be observed by the very limited human mind; it is **not** external to the overall universal order itself as run by the creator! He must have created the world in such a way that those things would happen when He wills, the way He wills, and for the sake of perfectness of the concept of miracle, we are made such that no matter how far we go with our material knowledge, we cannot even

approach the way many documented miracles were made to take place! Miracles thus do not destroy causality; they only take place outside the circle of the physically or statistically possible, but not outside the circle of rational possibility! They simply happen through causes that are out of our human ability to understand or follow (at a very far level in the chain of causes). There is no way we could know how the dead was brought back to life on the hands of prophet Jesus – for example – or how Mary gave birth to him without a father! But we do understand that there are causes and effects, and that the Earth, the visible universe, the heavens above, and all creatures therein, are created such that miracles go in exactly the way we are told they did; there's nothing irrational about it; nothing "rationally **impossible**"! As for scientific explanations; we will always know too little, and we should learn how far the tool of "science" could go!

This is why the great Muslim scholar Ibn Taymeyah stated that Islam (the Qur'an and the Sunnah) may tell us about things or events that are beyond our ability to explain (unexplainable) (like something too grand for our minds to grasp) but it never tells us about things that are rationally impossible! Things that make us wonder how they happened, but never things that our minds find **impossible** to happen!

This sharp distinction is a very important meaning that I believe is seriously lacking in the western philosophy of science today, and in the discourse of people like Dawkins who claim a Miracle according to all religions to be a "violation of natural laws"! What laws? It's only a violation of what we could currently – or ever – explain according to our current theoretical model of the world; a violation of the way we – according to our limited knowledge - expect things to happen! It's a violation of what we are used to see and expect! But to speak as though we currently have the universe all figured out like an open book, and we know all we need to know to explain anything we may ever observe, and that therefore we know for a fact that "the laws of the universe" should allow for this or that and not allow for this or that; this is sheer blindness and arrogance, and is in fact a demolition of the very motive that should keep the process of scientific research itself in progress! It is only because we do realize that we know too little about the

world around us, that we are always eager to learn more about it, and we never stop researching and re-adjusting our theories, models, equations and laws!

This discussion urges us to establish a clear definition of what exactly we mean every time we use the term: (natural laws) or (natural law)! If by natural laws we mean our limited understanding of the way the universe works, and our currently mainstream theorization and mathematical formulation of the very little that we know about it; then yes by all means miracles do – by this definition – defy those laws and break them! It is only true if by "law" we mean our humanly limited model of the universe! But if we mean the way the universe works in reality, the way it is kept in perfect equilibrium with all those diverse events taking place everywhere within it, those we know and are aware of some of their causes, those we know nothing about, and even those we will never have the ability to know or understand; then we cannot claim miracles to be exceptional to *that* law or to break it! This will only be speaking of something we have no authority of knowledge upon! Moreover it would be an irrational claim to make because obviously, no matter what happens in the universe; it is always in perfect balance, always progressing in anthropic perfection; and it has been going on as such ever since documented history can recall!

Those natural laws that we currently know are only the latest of our humble human efforts to describe and explain what we see in the commonly observable world! No matter how many variables and causes we manage to incorporate with our chosen formulation of a certain law of nature, it will never be final or complete!

So when an atheist insists on explaining everything by means of what he calls "natural causes" he is being dogmatically irrational and narrow-minded, more so – in fact - than any follower of any other incoherent belief system! This is because by "natural" he does not mean causes that are rationally **plausible**, and could be verified by the scientific method or any other reasonable method; he rather means causes that are **empirically examinable** and/or **statistically probable**; ones that should analogize one way or another to something he currently knows, understands and could

quantify, and can only be verified through the scientific method alone! Cannot think of a mind any narrower than this! The scientific method itself cannot be validated – as a method of acquiring knowledge – by means of the scientific method, so how does a man with such a feeble mentality argue for his method, and for its basic theoretical foundations? And if he insists, then how does he know that those metaphysical causes, said to be found somewhere on the chain of causes or beyond, and currently out of reach of the scientific method, will not one day become observable, or if not; will never come to be proven true by other means of proof and plausible argumentation than direct observation and empirical testing?

That's the point here! Every atheist claims he is ready and prepared to accept that when it happens, and that he's open to the possibility, when practically he is not! He chooses to readily deny everything that comes from any source other than his labs and experiments; or to be accurate, anything that comes from the department of religion and scripture in particular! But what if something does exist, but cannot be proven to exist by means of direct observation, not now or ever in the future of our existence in this world? Does this mean it cannot be proven true at all? Do those revered scientists claim that man can only obtain evident knowledge by means of direct observation? If that were true, then they should not bother at all to examine works of philosophers or logicians or even practice any form of rational deduction whatsoever (even under the scientific method itself), and at that, no observation they ever make would ever lead them to any knowledge other than the fact that those things they observe do exist as they are!

I hope this insight is clear enough to my respectable reader!

You'll find that an atheist scientist would attempt everything he can do to explain any strange or anomalous phenomenon within his current knowledge of physics (and this would be very plausible of him indeed, as long as he sees no plausible, valid reason that suggests anything else to his mind or directs him to take any other root in his investigation)! But when he fails, he will readily take a leap of faith and cut the way against what he calls "supernatural causes" only because he does not believe in the possibility of

there being anything supernatural in existence, or to be more precise; because he insists on rejecting the existence of God!

He would say that if one day he could see the "supernatural" and inspect it scientifically, then it will be natural, and only then would he accept such an explanation! But what if we offered him evidence – not by necessity from observation - that proves the existence of some "supernatural" entity with "supernatural causes" that are indeed parts of the way the world works, and are indeed active parts of the universe, ones that we simply cannot observe! Would he accept that evidence? Or would he still insist on using (highly improbable) as a synonym to (rationally impossible)?

Even Gravity, the most famous of all standard laws of nature that we currently know, may one day be seen to halt, or to reverse its effect, by means of other "natural" causes! Let's reflect further on the freefalling ball example. Imagine what would happen if one day you threw an apple to the ground and instead of accelerating down, you noticed that it decelerated, until it actually froze in the middle of the distance between your hand and the ground! You would automatically be shocked, and questioning your eyesight you'd utter the words: "this is impossible! It's a violation of the laws of nature!" well, in fact it's not! It's only a violation of what you **know** and expect to see, due to a lifetime of experience with gravity on Earth! It may very well be an anomaly, one that happened perhaps due to some electromagnetic field, or even an advanced invention that may affect gravity and is being tested somewhere nearby, or something of the sort, something **you** simply do not know how to explain! It might as well be due to the work of some unseen creature to us that has the power to affect things in our world in such a visible way! Both possibilities are not to be excluded to the onlooker as "irrational"! All evidence is to be examined and only the most plausible explanatory argument should be accepted, regardless of what discipline of knowledge it may come from!

If I said: Beyond that direct cause that you currently do not know, is a series of other observable causes that you do not yet know either, which ends at some unobservable entities that are only the unseen beings that what Muslims call (Angels), could you accuse me of speaking an irrational

meaning?! Of course not! This is not rationally impossible! It has nothing to do with probability because obviously we never saw anything of the sort; we simply have no grounds for probabilistic reasoning here! This is a claim that goes beyond the scope of this particular method of argumentation!

So the fact that we Muslims did not know about Angels through the tool of science, and cannot validate their existence by means of this tool; does not make it superstition! And while you may one day come to learn and explain such a phenomenon if you ever saw it, by means of visible and observable causes, you cannot deny the fact that causes do regress to the point where you must admit factors that are beyond human power to observe or imagine, beyond which is the creator Himself! So there will always be another cause beyond the last one that you know, and another one beyond that, all the way up to that End! There will always be a greater value than the greatest value you could currently count, all the way up to the point of infinity. And right now; you may not know even the closest and most direct of observable causes!

In the Heavenly revealed knowledge of Islam, we are told that there are Angels responsible for the rain, others responsible for the growth of plants, others responsible for the progress of a fetus in the womb of its mother, others responsible for recording every word that every man speaks, and so forth. Those “agents” are intelligent beings that act by the command of their Lord, with no choice or option – by creation – to disobey or revolt. They are willful, powerful, obedient creatures, part of the system, working far at the end of the chain of created causes! The question now is, am I to be called superstitious or mythical only because I believe this to be true? This accusation is really nothing but the position of a man who insists on not knowing! A denial so eloquently described in the Quran in this verse: ***((Nay, but they denied that the knowledge whereof they could not compass, and whereof the interpretation (in events) hath not yet come unto them. Even so did those before them deny. Then see what the consequence was for the wrongdoers!))*** Translation of the Quran (10|39)

My argument for the validity of this claim is the authenticity of the texts where those miracles are mentioned, as true revelation to a man who is

already verified as a true messenger of the creator (who is in turn, known to exist by rational necessity)! So there is indeed a sound and rationally consistent sequence of proof and verification here that no atheist could possibly argue against by simply saying: “This is highly improbable” or “this is not scientifically verifiable”! So what I’m out to do with this book is to first cure the mental problem – and I do believe it to be a psychological problem - that leaves an atheist inclined to deny his own maker, then I tell him that I can prove to him that this man (my proclaimed prophet) was indeed contacted by the creator and that he spoke His words by His authority, and then comes the quest of examining what scripture was indeed spoken by that prophet, and what was not!

So yes I never saw any of those Angels, but I can prove to you that the texts where those Angels are mentioned are authentic and are evidently part of none but the words of the creator Himself and his true messenger! If I could do that, then you should have no rational reason whatsoever to deny the existence of Angels and the role those texts claim them to be doing in the universe, no matter how unimaginable it may be to you, because clearly this does not in any way contradict with reason or with any observational facts that we ever made or will ever come to make! We never claimed – for example – that they drop the rain from some big bucket in their hands while hiding somewhere behind the clouds! This naïve, cartoonish image is not even remotely suggested by any text that we possess! In fact we Muslims condemn and reject the fallacious depictions of Angels as painted by renaissance artists in Christian Churches (those naked winged children), and we do not take such an issue lightly! But this is no bigger a crime than the way Michelangelo dared to actually depict the Lord almighty Himself (praise be) as an old half-naked fellow with a white beard, resting on a cloud, is it?! This is sheer paganism and blasphemy by all means! It is the influence of the Greek imagery of Zeus, not the influence of any evidently prophetic or heavenly teachings about God!

We certainly do not claim Angels to look like human children with two wings! We never said they are visible to us, or that we know **how** they do their jobs! In fact we know from scripture that they are gigantic creatures

made from light, and that they are invisible to man, and unimaginably powerful; hence they are not to be analogized to man in any way! It is mentioned that they do have wings (up to six hundred wings!), ears and shoulders, but apart from that, we're not told much about their actual looks (they do have the power to take human form after the command of Allah) Now my question: Does any of this sound irrational or impossible to you? No, it doesn't! Neither do you have any grounds to dismiss them as "improbable"!

I will not resort to the Quantum ambiguity to argue for the existence of Angels like some people would do! I will not propose any relation between the work of Angels and what is observed on the Quantum subatomic level, like many ignorant or less-informed Muslims may be tempted to do! I do not hang my faith in the validity of what scripture tells me, on this mystery or on any other mystery! This is **not** the way I acquired my knowledge about those beings in the first place, and I do not ask for more than I've been told about them, because I know that if the Lord had known that we humans needed to learn more on that level, or to know how Angels do what they do, He would have taught us! But we simply don't!

Those Muslims who passed before us, they never failed to do what they were supposed to do with their lives, because of lacking this knowledge, neither did they suffer any inconvenience with the way they lived because of that! This is what wisdom means after all! Putting everything in its right place, with its right quantity and quality, not a single bit more or less! Not all that **can** be known, **should** be known for a man to do what he is supposed to do with his life! I – personally - do not need to learn – for example – to speak Chinese, to live a prosperous life the way that fulfills the purpose of my creation on Earth, any more than I or any other man needs to learn how Angels do what we are told they do! It simply does not concern any of us, human beings! The wisdom of a wise teacher is known not by how much he teaches, but by the purpose and effectiveness of what he teaches (The 'ILO'). If you don't need to learn X for the fulfillment of the purpose of your education, then your teacher would only be doing you wrong to teach X to you! Life is not without a purpose, and time is not without a cost!

So my faith in Angels - a soundly verified faith – does not hinder my process of inquiry about natural causes in any way, or cause me to say every time I meet something I do not understand: (Oh It must be the work of an Angel or just the work of God)! Yes it is so, but I'm supposed to do my best to learn whatever I ***need*** to learn to fulfill and facilitate the purpose of my life on this planet! I am **commanded** to make use of every resource in this planet for this end, in the very same book that teaches me about those Angels and what they do in the unseen! In Islam, the scientific enterprise is not a blind inquiry that seeks to build the entire structure of human knowledge on its own, we do not resort to the scientific method to demand answers that cannot be afforded by natural science, and we do not waste our lives chasing worthless, not to mention unobtainable knowledge!

In a created system, of which I am only a small part, made for a particular purpose, I should expect my ability to obtain knowledge of the universe to be limited – by creation – by the kind of knowledge humans need, to fulfill the purpose for which they were created. We humans are here to be tested by all the givens of this life, including knowledge itself, to make the right choices; to use everything we are given for what our creator tells us to do. This statement is not a statement of science, and by no means could it be obtained or verified by the scientific method!

One of the reasons why evolutionists enjoy the idea of their claim to have descended from primates is the fictional dream that the evolution of man will continue to progress until one day – perhaps in another million years or so - he becomes an immortal, Supreme Being, free from any boundaries or limits of any sort! This is why they would often contradict themselves in their view of man and his place in the universe! While they would often claim that man is indeed an extremely tiny being in a vast universe that should not – according to their materialistic philosophy – be viewed to be made exclusively for him, they would at the same time claim that one day man will be a transcendent being unbound by its laws and limits and able to take over it entirely in a manner that makes him an actual god, in every sense of the word! No wonder they dream of time travel and invading the galaxy!

The struggle in this system is only among those elements created precisely for the struggle! Angels are NOT parts of that struggle! It is a competitive struggle between good and bad, for man to be tested by it; it is what the system is made for! It cannot rise – this struggle – to a universal level that endangers the stability or the continuity of the system itself! It has to be limited – on creation - by the limitation of man, limitations from which he can never break free.

Man has to be limited in knowledge and power, or else the system will fail! We are not smarter now – collectively - than our grandfathers were! We just happen to enjoy a bigger accumulation of knowledge and experience than they used to have! So when we invent we start from a point that is more advanced – by accumulation, not by intelligence - than where they started! We learn from their mistakes and experiments, and because of our access to their efforts, we need not start from scratch! A man living in a civilization of Bamboo huts in some tribe in the Amazons, when he faces the problem of cutting down a tree, he is not expected to invent a chainsaw for the purpose, no matter how intelligent he may be! He will only create a handsaw of some sort! Is this because he is less intelligent or less "evolved" mentally than we are? No! It is simply because he started from a much smaller content of previous knowledge than that from which we would start today, in addressing every need and problem that he faces!

So, I'm sorry to disappoint you, but the human power and mental capacity, is today just as limited as it was yesterday, if not even more so! The human mind is not evolving! It's the accumulative content of knowledge that we currently have that makes us more advanced in our grasp of natural causes, than those who came before us on our local line of progression, each civilization according to its own determinants! Once we lose that, we'll go all the way back to where they were! There is a limit to human knowledge, and we cannot afford to exceed that limit! The more solutions and ideas we come up with, the greater problems we create, side by side with the solutions! The higher up you go, the bigger the damage you will take when you fall! The more questions we answer, the more the questions that would arise! This property is inherent in the way we approach the universe, in the

way we are built! We are limited by our nature as individuals, and our properties as a group of interacting beings! So yes we will always keep pushing it, but there will have to come a point where the tower will collapse no matter how high it rises! Decomposition is just as essential a process in the way this universe works, as composition! It's a perfect balance in a system that is perfectly designed for its purpose!

It is thus extremely pompous and presumptuous to call such an event – the suspension of a falling ball in midair - a violation of natural law, or to claim that it is impossible! No matter how little you currently know, and how much you may ever come to learn about it; it is indeed **possible**, as a phenomenon of nature! You can – on the other hand – call it **highly improbable** (as a phenomenon) because you never saw something like that before! This is an argument that builds on observation and accumulated knowledge of previous cases. Now I can argue that every time a ball falls to the ground; Angels determine the way it will behave, and that they are responsible – in ways I do not know - for keeping the system consistent with all laws of gravitation running on Earth the way we observe them, but this would not be an argument that comes from observation and empirical science, and thus it cannot be approached by probabilistic reasoning!

So to sum it up, if the phenomenon in question here is X, you may say (based on observation and previous experience): "It is improbable that X will take place today". But you may not say: "It is unlikely or improbable that any unseen beings had anything to do with it"!

The problem thus is with the atheist's conviction that all causes must be limited to what is observable to man, and that the end of the chain of causes must be something perceptually and cognitively viable to us as humans! This is where an atheist's problem really is! It is the reason why his logic in approaching the subject matter is so spurious!

Now my question to every honest and free reader is this: Do I appear, in any way, by this reasoning here, to encourage superstitious assumptions and explanations that "fill the gaps" with fairy tales and myths or with the irrational, the un-provable, or the impossible? Absolutely not! I'm urging

every sane reader to be open to possibilities that could be proven true by other means than direct observation, and are not bound to our limited human abilities to observe! I'm asking him to break free from this corrupt philosophy that controls the way atheists view the world, the process of science and the human mind itself!

This example I just gave is an example of an event that is rationally not impossible, but at the same time, extremely improbable! How likely is it that when you let go of a little ball from your hand, it will behave this way in apparently normal conditions? Very unlikely! However, your mind as a human cannot allow calling it impossible! Yes it certainly will leave you dazzled, incapable of explaining it or analogizing it to anything you have ever seen! So when a man you trust, and you know is an honest man who would never tell a lie, comes to you with a claim that he did witness such a strange phenomenon, you would perhaps question his mental fitness on the outset of it, and you may have him tested for it, but when all reasons that may have you question his honesty and his awareness of what he had seen are positively invalidated, what will you do then? At that point you will have to admit the occurrence of such a phenomenon, despite its extremely high improbability, and the fact that you cannot think of any possible explanation for it that fits it within your personal knowledge!

This is why while for example the event of Moses (peace be upon him) splitting the sea is by definition a highly improbable event (it's not something we see every day, or we would normally expect to see) for a man do to the sea with his cane, it cannot be dismissed as impossible! Our minds do not know of any reason to deny its possibility! There's a long chain of unseen and unknown causes beyond it, ending at the will of the creator beyond the system itself, just as it is the case with every natural event that takes place in the universe and that we see around us every day! The only difference is we never saw this particular event caused this way before!

One thus has to clearly define what he means when he says: I seek a **scientific explanation** for a given event. If by explanation, he means the direct observable causes that can be utilized by man for his benefit on this planet then we do agree with him entirely, and we are certainly following the

same process of natural science and empirical experimentation that leads to such knowledge (if of course we think we need to obtain this knowledge)! We do that, because we are given those tools for a purpose that we know from its only right source. We know we have to make full use of all resources on Earth for that purpose. So if this is what they mean by explanation, then we have no dispute; and this is plausible, purposeful and useful science! But if by explanation they mean the materialist denial of the unseen, unobservable, that is - by necessity of reason - there at the end of the chain, and they only aim at the blind denial of what they do not know; then we certainly do not agree to that, and it is by no means to be called "good science"!

When I explain a hurricane – for example – as the effect of certain conditions of wind, humidity, temperature, and other variables I have learnt to describe such phenomena in terms of, I'm trying to understand as much as I can of the chain of causes that leads to such a phenomenon! At that, no contradiction or rational conflict of any form would happen when at the same time I say: "It was Allah who commanded that this hurricane take place"! Because by that I clearly mean that it was by His command and power that all causes (those we currently observe, those we do not yet observe, and those we may never come to observe at all) came all in order for this exact event to take place in this exact way that it did! There's no "gap" here that we're just trying to *fill* with God!

Atheists would repeatedly accuse all people of religion of having to push the "god" factor further away every time a new discovery comes to argue a "natural phenomenon" to be an explanatory cause! Well, I have to ask here: Who on earth ever said that Muslims view the Lord almighty to be "hiding" somewhere in the world, acting within any chain of causes, sending thunder bolts like spears in his hand from atop a mountain, as it is the common imagery that infiltrates every pagan faith, or any 'Abrahamic' religion that was originally monotheistic but was stained by paganism (as it is the case especially with Catholicism)? The correct and rational position to think of the Lord is that He is external to the system and to the entire chain, as we explained earlier!

Atheists would also raise the objection that what is called "Divine intervention" is totally improbable and maybe even impossible, because it is likely to destroy the system's balance and consistency! Well, this objection indicates clearly how little those people think – or rather how little they *choose* to believe - of the **creator of the system**! It's as though they have cut Him away from it, and are now objecting to the ways "theists" are trying to put Him back in (may His names be praised)! The creator is not a limited being in the system who does not know the consequences of his actions! He is – by necessity - in lordly control and dominion upon every single thing that takes place in the universe, no matter how little or mundane!

So while you, the limited human mind, may take centuries to imagine in what way a certain action could affect a natural process that is in direct proximity to that action, He, the creator, is the only being that possesses complete knowledge of the way every single thing in this universe is linked in effect to everything else, throughout space and time! The way a hurricane in America in one season affects a flock of migrating birds flying somewhere over Siberia in another season, is something you, the limited man may never manage to figure out! We know by necessity of reason that He not only knows that, He **intends** it (creates it) precisely and perfectly, and all its simultaneous effects taking place everywhere else, for purpose! A hurricane may only be seen by our limited eye to have taken down homes and killed hundreds of people; but we cannot claim that only this is what the Lord intended by it! Each and everything that this hurricane caused, everywhere in the universe, all the way to the end of time; is intended by the creator of the universe for a purpose that is previously determined in perfect wisdom! A sane man who respects his own mind cannot expect anything less of the creator of the universe. A hurricane may destroy an evil group of people, and hence do mercy to many by terminating those people's evil; it may at the same time bring punishment to those who deserve it, hence do justice upon those who deserve it, here before the afterlife! It may at the same time, cause many natural and ecological benefits, little of which is what we could really follow at our current level of scientific knowledge! All catastrophes of nature do nature good, and have a positive effect on it! So

often do we find ourselves saying: “if it wasn’t for this disaster, I wouldn’t have had this good that came to me!”

The point is, all events that take place in the universe are by definition “divinely controlled”, and there is no such a thing as “divine intervention” because the Lord in reality does not Intervene, He never let go of it, so that his actions when they take place would be deemed exceptional or “interventional” to it! He runs it all continuously in seamless perfection! Everything is only as He chose and willed!

It seems to me that it is Western Christians – not pagans - that should be blamed for the spread of this pathetic notion of what they call “divine intervention” in western cultures of today.

A clear example of certain events that many Christians would falsely call divine intervention is when you survive a sinking ship and come out alive! Or when you get lost in the desert and somebody manages to rescue you! Or when you – for example – book a ticket on a flight, and you get delayed for some reason, so you miss it, and the next morning you learn in the News that it crashed and no one survived! At that moment you’d feel “thankful” that you were delayed! Thankful to whom exactly, that’s what the whole thing is about! The Lord did not “intervene” to save you like Christians may believe! He was running the whole thing from A to Z, and His choice to save you did not come as an intervention! He did not do a miracle to save you! He did not have to break the progress of life for your sake! He simply had all events in the universe progressing in the only way that would lead – inexorably – to this event of yours, and to all other events that took place in the universe at the same time that yours was taking place! It may be – to you – extremely unlikely that this may ever happen to you again in your life! This is why you could say it is highly improbable, but it happened anyway! And because it is that improbable, and your life was obviously “spared” from imminent death, it impacts you deeply, and makes you think of the proper way to feel and the right thing to do in reaction to that! Yes indeed He had mercy on you, and yes He answered your prayer, and you ought to be grateful to Him for that, but the point is that what He did was not an “*intervention*”!

When we say it was the creator who saved you, do not imagine Him as some invisible figure tampering – for example – with the engines of some cars to cause a traffic jam in your way to the airport so that you would be delayed! This is what you, the limited human would do if you learnt that it is certainly going to crash! The Lord, on the other hand, holding the fates of all humans in His hands, and the paths of all causes and events in the universe, causes this traffic jam with all ordinary causes, just like He causes every similar event everywhere, because just like every other traffic jam, it was planned – so to speak - to take place in this exact place, at this exact time; for countless purposes, and not for your sake alone, or to impact your life alone!

It is meant not only for you to be kept from reaching the flight that may have taken you to your death, but also for a business man to miss a business meeting that would have doubled his fortune, and for another man to have enough time to reconsider alone in his car a fight he just had with his wife, and decide to turn around in the next turn and apologize to her, and for another man to read an article he may have never had the chance to read anywhere else, and for another man to miss a conversation that would have destroyed his career if he were to be part of it …. Etc.! All those *storylines*, and hundreds, even millions of others, have this little traffic jam placed in their path in this particular point in space and time for a certain purpose, impacting their lives in ways very few of them could anticipate, ways by which they are all tested, whether they know it or not! Would this man be thankful and reconsider his evil choices? Would this woman bored to death waiting as she is, put her mind and heart in something that is good for her, or would she curse the "luck", the traffic, and perhaps start a fight with another driver; and so forth?

This is how unimaginably complicated and intertwined the system is, with all its long chains of purposeful causes and events; ultimately controlled and mastered all simultaneously by none but the creator Himself! Yes God saved your life and you should be grateful because if He so willed He could've let you die; but He did not 'intervene' in the chain of events to do it, in the sense that is usually implied by the common use of the term 'intervention'! "Intervention" in this meaning is nothing but a pagan conception of the way

God runs the universe! And it is from there that the atheist objection to the concept came to arise!

So it should be reasonably clear that no matter how many "natural" causes we may ever come to discover, the fact still remains that the First cause at the very far end, beyond the system, is the Almighty Creator and there's not a single rational reason to believe otherwise, and clearly, there never will be! We do not put the creator in any "gaps" within the system that we do not understand! In fact whoever does that is a Pagan – or influenced by paganism - who is easily to be proven false by texts of the true religion maybe even many centuries before the discovery of any fact of nature that could debunk him comes to pass! Knowledge, again, is not only obtained by direct observation! It is not exclusively, fundamentally, or even mostly; a scientific endeavor!

Reiterating to the issue of probabilistic logic in atheistic argumentation, and after this long – but necessary – discussion, I repeat that things that may be labeled (improbable) simply because we never saw anything like them, *cannot* by any right or reason be labeled "impossible"! It should be fairly clear now to every reasonable man of science that **things that are by necessity or by definition <u>external</u> to our scope of materialistic observation or experience cannot be submitted to probabilistic logic!**

Yet, we can see the professor - and many of his Christian denigrators actually, not just his atheist fans - lay too much weight upon statistical probability as though it determines with certainty - the kind of certainty that is demanded when dealing with the question of whether or not "creatures" where "created"! - the possibility or impossibility of a certain event taking place! As though this relatively primitive "guessing game" (that's all it's really is! Just guessing) qualifies as rational evidence to prove or disprove the possibility of a certain event, not to mention refute a rational necessity!

It is clear to me now, that this conceptual confusion is somehow due to the original definition of probability by mathematicians as a Real number ranging between 0 and 1, so that the value (0) represents "impossibility", while level (1) represents "certainty"!

If we pondered on the way by which we determine the degree of probability, we will see that no matter how many cases we study, even if they all proved to be in favor of X, (hence giving a P value of (1)) this still does not mean by necessity, that X should happen every time, or that the next time we study a similar case, we could be **certain** that X will take place! If I examined ten cases, I may conclude that P(X) = 1! But if I examined a hundred cases, how do I guarantee that P(X) should still be (1) all the same? Even if it was, how can I dare claim that this means the next time I witness a similar case; I should be **certain** to expect nothing but X? This is a fundamental problem with the way probability is *applied* and the nature of conclusion many scientists may feel tempted to draw from it! No, (P(X) = 0), does not in any way mean that X is impossible! Neither does (P(X) = 1) mean that X is certain!

However it must be said that mathematicians are not to blame for this misconception! The theory of probability does indeed make a clear distinction between "certain" and "almost sure"! Although, it still needs to be confirmed and made clear that the meaning "almost sure" does not at all mean certain! However, the problem is with the way scientists view this terminology and apply it in their research!

When a man rolls a die, he knows that whatever he does, he will always come up with one out of six possible outcomes. This is because his definition of the sample space is based on a strictly determined set of possibilities that he decided by his own design. So unless something anomalous or totally unexpected comes to take place, he knows with near certainty that the dice would never give him a result of (7) for example! He designed it so it has only six faces with six values from 1 to 6. And since he does not possess any reliable knowledge of the exact way that the laws of nature will affect this die as it rolls on the ground, he does not know which of the six faces will be facing up when it comes to rest; he only knows it has to be one of the six faces. Now applying probabilistic reasoning here, we know that there is a (1/6) chance that he gets the result (2) for example in a particular roll. But what does this value mean? What good does it do this man in such a game? How is it helping him get the value he desires in any

given roll? Well, in reality it does nothing at all! He only knows a set of possibilities, but not the particular element of this set that he should expect in every roll that he makes. Now suppose this man kept rolling the same die for tens of times in a row, and every time he got only one of two values: say (3) and (6) for example; he doesn't seem to get any other value, could he make the prediction that it is improbable that the next time he rolls, he gets any value other than those two values? No he couldn't, even if statistical calculations suggest it! To say that the number (6) for example shows up very rarely in the rolls of this man no matter how many times he rolls, this doesn't give us any rule to make a reliable prediction about the occurrence of the number (6)! One that would make him feel safe to bet his money on it! So to say that it is 1:1000 probability that the next roll gives the value of (6), based on the observation of previous rolls on the hands of that man (frequency view), this is a meaningless application of probability and it is indeed misleading! We cannot know the rule by which any sequential incidence of values may be taking place in the sequence of rolls by this man, and we cannot even postulate it theoretically; so what's the meaning or the use of such an application of statistical probability? Perhaps in another experiment with other conditions this frequency of occurrence will have a different meaning or significance, but in a dice roll it clearly means nothing at all!

Now what I did here was to utilize a commonly used example in probability literature to demonstrate that it is not always plausible to rely upon probabilistic reasoning for inference of future predictions even when the subject matter is open to natural observation and comparison! That is to say, even though probability may apply here, it is wrong to actually apply it! No matter how many times it turns out to be in your favor, you could still lose your money in the game! Which is exactly why gambling is prohibited in Islam!

The problem is clearly a problem of philosophy: How exactly a scientist interprets his observations in probabilistic terms, and what conclusions he builds upon this terminology or interpretation! This philosophical misinterpretation has indeed affected the minds of laypeople and even

intellectuals in the West today, under the influence of atheistic philosophies of science.

It may be highly unlikely that disease X will kill you, but it still could! So learning about this probabilistic estimate concerning your condition should not – by any means - change the way you view your position as a humble creature always seeking the mercy of his creator! Yes there are measures you can and you should take against highly probable dangers and risk factors; but even the most improbable of all dangers are equally possible, and can befall you any time even when you least expect them! So if X and Z are two opposite events; the meanings of high probability of X, and high improbability of Z are not the same, and should not have the same impact on your conception of either of them, and the difference between the two meanings varies a lot from one certain case to another! There are indeed cases where probability estimates should mean nothing at all, and have no impact whatsoever on your decision!

Now the problem with applying probabilistic logic in this issue in hand here, the issue of creation, is indeed much deeper than this! It is absolutely meaningless, and makes no sense at all, either for the argument or against it! **It goes without saying, that we have never witnessed any process of origination of life from inanimate matter before, not to mention the origination of inanimate matter itself from nothingness or from another form of physical material the likes of which we have never seen**! So by what human reason can we possibly attempt to describe creation – or the Darwinian proposition – in terms of probability? To say X is probable is to say: "Out of my previous experience with similar cases I think it is very likely that X will happen, or X is the right explanation"! But when we speak of the origin of the universe itself; what experience could there be, and where is the set of events that could be examined in such a way to begin with? There is no empirical basis for observation of frequency! And even if we had one, how many cases do you think you need to have observed before coming up with the claim that it is highly improbable that the event took place by a single act of creation or by whatever it is that you propose in its stead?

Some Christian apologetics may argue earnestly that since every physical variable that we know of in the universe could have taken any other value, and yet it was fixed within the only range that allows for our existence, then it is exponentially improbable that all those values were fixed this way without a willful and determinate creator! (The Anthropic principle) Well, I say the fact that all those “variables” were indeed “fixed” and determined by none but the creator Himself is too obvious to be denied! But to insert the probabilistic reasoning in this argument is to commit the very same crime that atheists commit against mathematical probability and the philosophy of natural science! The event of creation (or the origination of the universe) is a singular event that happened only once; there are no other universes with other values for those variables that do not permit for life; we never saw any, and we never will; so what on Earth would bring mathematical probability to such an argument? Those apologists - I dare to say – are following blindly on the logical footsteps of atheist philosophers of science!

There is not a single event in the universe as we now observe it that could be analogized to such a unique event (by necessity of reason) to begin with! So it’s bogus to apply probabilistic reasoning here!

Probability does not apply to the origin of the universe or natural life for the reasons we explained. But as for the example of the Boeing 747, and the monkey typist, it may, under specific conditions and controls, apply to them, such that we may say that though it is highly improbable that some billion hurricanes may end up assembling the craft, or a billion hits on the typewriter may produce a meaningful paragraph or even a single phrase; it is not impossible in principle under certain conditions and controls.

Let me explain.

In the Christmas lectures (Growing up in the Universe) by Dawkins, in the third lecture: ‘Climbing mount improbable’ he mentioned the Boeing 747 example, and stated that for a hurricane to assemble it in one shot by chance; that’s impossible! But if that was to take place gradually on a very long span of time, in gradual ‘steps’ of chance; then it will not be impossible, and the improbability will drop considerably! Perhaps if a couple of million

hurricanes succeeded in randomly moving those same pieces around, placing those pieces in place one random step at a time, then eventually, we may come to see a complete Boeing after all!

(http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YT1vXXMsYak&ap=%2526fmt%3D18&feature=PlayList&p=ED4BA3683D0273ED&index=2)

This, I should say; is sheer and utter nonsense!

Let us first speak of the Boeing and the hurricanes in further detail. Imagine that the pieces of the Boeing were scattered in an open desert, and the first hurricane passed over those pieces, what do you expect would happen? Well, I suppose that the hurricane would most likely throw those pieces much farther apart from each other, and get them scattered over vast distances in the desert! This means that we are speaking of near impossibility that any two pieces would even as much as come close to the place where they should both fit in the design of the Boeing, because of the first hurricane alone!

Now, what do you expect, my kind reader, the next hurricane would do? Well, I suppose that if the spacing between the pieces was greater than the width of the hurricane (which is what we should expect under the devastating effect of the previous one), then it is only likely that the second hurricane would pass over a limited number of the pieces, not on all of them! And in doing so, it will carry those pieces along and get them thrown away even farther than before, from the rest of the already messed up lot! So we can see that the introduction of more hurricanes would actually make it far more hopeless for any two pieces to even get anywhere close to each other as they fly through the air, not to mention get attached to one another by chance! Now the important question here is: am I speaking of an improbability that is growing exponentially greater with each hurricane in this example? No! You wish! It was already as good as impossible from square one! The initial conditions being laid out as such, make for no chance that any fruitful assembly would ever happen, not in a billion billion years! This is also true of a case where we get a monkey, and place it to a typewriter, and ask it to keep hitting the buttons merrily as it wishes! Not in

a Billion years could you expect to get any composition of letters that makes any sense!

So what experimental *measures* could we take to shift the problem from the area of near impossibility to high improbability? (Mark the word: *Measures*) Ok, let's broaden our imagination and **design** certain **restrictions** and **conditions**. Should we perhaps get the pieces of the Boeing tied up to one another and to the ground with some loose ropes, so that we would avoid the problem of the hurricane causing them to scatter and get thrown miles apart beyond any hope of return? Should we perhaps add some strong fences around the area where the pieces were initially scattered? Should we fix some magnets in the pieces so that whenever – or if ever - it happens that they fly near one another, they may get drawn to each other and the probability of their getting attached in the right spot would elevate? I'm pretty sure that Dawkins would find these ideas interesting, and would even think that they could make it imaginable that a multitude of hurricanes could somehow get this poor craft assembled after all! He may then estimate it to take place in only a few Billion years rather than a billion billion years! He may propose something similar to this in the typewriter for the monkey! If perhaps some device was added to it that would only get a letter typed if it hits its right place in the sentence, then perhaps given a sufficient span of time, and a very patient monkey, we would eventually get ourselves an intelligible sentence! The sentence that was already determined and was controlled by this new device in the typewriter! Such a previously determined rule would make it possible in theory, and perhaps boost the probability to the level of 'highly improbable'!

But wait a minute! I thought you were making an example for the origin of life **in the absence of any previously "designed", "determined", "controlled" or conditioned medium for any particular purpose whatsoever**! After all, the particles involved in the first reaction of origins were – according to your *faith* – not previously 'manufactured' as "pieces" according to any previous blueprint, were they? There is supposed to be no previously determined design or rule that tells every two organic compounds where to go in a previously "designed" scheme for the structure of a cell, not

to mention those additional rules and algorithms of control for the 'random progress' that we had to add to the Boeing and the monkey's typewriter! There is no initial condition and no control rule whatsoever, because there is supposed to be no previous **purpose** of assembling an aircraft or typing a precise paragraph in the first place!

So obviously we are not talking about an improbability, but rather initial **impossibility**, no matter how many billions of years may pass! You have only established that in order for any chance event to have any constructive effect, there must be a previously determined rule for what has to go where, or what is to be "selected" and to remain in place! Without that rule; there are no "pieces of a Boeing" to begin with! No reasonable definition of the word "piece" can be claimed at all! So even by your false application of probability to the event of origins, you have no choice but to acknowledge that in order for the origination of anything at all to be as much as "highly improbable"; some initial condition has to be defined in advance, in addition to some previously determined rule of assembly according to which only the "right" random addition is selected and kept in place!

Now if this – in meaning- is not DESIGN (purposeful creation and programming), I wonder what other word the professor finds for it in his dictionary!

This is the problem that Darwinians refuse to admit! In order for a random factor (like mutation) to work constructively with the previously determined code (like natural selection) the way they claim it did; this does indeed demand a previously determined plan, one that would – at least – define what piece, organ, cell, or organism works and what doesn't!

Anyway, I do not find this example worthy of any further commentary.

I hope I have made my point clear that probability is irrelevant here, and is not properly applied; neither by evolutionists, nor by many of their opponents!

As for the irrational idea of (gradual accumulation of events of chance "accumulating the luck"; or as often propagated metaphorically by Dawkins:

climbing up mount improbable); this idea is fundamentally flawed, rationally and linguistically, and is by no means any more rational than the (1*1*1 = 1) parable for justifying the trinity, as we shall come to elaborate later on! Just as it is the case that (1*1*1) will never give us (3), **(0+0+0) will never result in (1)! (0+0+0 = 0)!**

"You do not know the first thing about Natural Selection!"

The position that most evolutionists would easily take against "creationists" or against anybody who challenges evolutionism and Darwinism, is the famous response: "You do not understand evolution"!

Well, obviously, no matter what anybody would ever come to argue; there's no way he's going to change the professor's mind or make him have a second thought about the concept of creation (unless of course Allah wills otherwise)! So no matter what arguments you raise against him; it's settled for him! No matter what rational evidence you could offer him: you're wrong and *you don't understand the first thing about evolution or Natural Selection*! It's done for him!

The point I'm making with this is that; while Dawkins so easily dismisses the meaning of faith altogether as a disease that mutes reason and rational thinking, without making any distinction whatsoever between having faith in something that is evidently true and valid, and faith in something that stands no evidence whatsoever, while he takes his assault on all faith to extreme measures, he fails to realize that his position is indeed a position of blind faith, and that he is no different from any follower of a false system of beliefs, except in the fact that those beliefs were made in the mind of a bunch of materialist atheist scientists, rather than philosophers of metaphysics or priests of a temple or theologians of church!

Faith does not mean – as atheists would often repeat – belief without evidence! This sick extrapolation of fallacy on all faith is a fanatic reaction to the false faith someone like Dawkins may have been brought up on as a child or surrounded with in his society! The man simply does not know what it's like to be on a true faith which qualifies to be the valid truth in perfect

accord with reason and evidence! So he must understand that his personal ignorance is no argument against all “faith”! Faith in the truth and fulfilling a life of wisdom accordingly is by all mean the head of all virtues ever known to man!

Yes I’m afraid you’d find that definition he propagates of faith in many dictionaries (probably adopted originally by an atheist like himself!) but you must have noticed – if you have ever looked it up in a dictionary before – that there are indeed other meanings, and that the most famous and conventional meaning (taken from its etymology) is this:

“Confidence or **trust** in a person or thing: *faith in another's ability.”*

"**Origin:**
1200–50; ME *feith* < AF *fed,* OF *feid, feit* < L *fidem,* acc. of *fīdēs* trust, akin to *fīdere* to **trust**.”

(http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/faith)

So he is indeed a man of faith, no matter how he evades or denies it! And by examining his arguments and objections against the creator and all religion, he is revealed not only as a man of “faith” but of “false religion” and “false doctrine”; “blind faith” that is! A faith he’s working so hard to put in the place of all other religions regarding the origins and the metaphysical! This is “religion” even if he denies the terminology, and it is faith no matter what he says to deny it! He says people should let go of religion! But this belief is in fact his own personal religion! Religion is defined in the dictionary as

> “a specific fundamental set of beliefs and practices generally agreed upon by a number of persons or sects”

("religion." *Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1)*. Random House, Inc. 01 Sep. 2009. <Dictionary.com http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/religion>.)

So it makes no difference whether you observe certain rituals or you don’t, you are a preacher of religion all the same! Every human being has a religion by this definition, one that defines his personal beliefs about the metaphysical, the purpose of life, and the code of morality that is implied by this belief, regardless of what that belief is and where exactly he gets it from.

The bias and sheer prejudice exhibited here by the professor, is the same you'd expect of all preachers of false religion, except it goes under a cloak of "science" here! He easily dismisses and even makes fun of every other explanatory "theory" that comes in contrast to Darwinism, accuses every holder of any suggestion of an 'intelligent designer' of ignorance, and ridicules, even insults creation as a concept that is not even worth consideration on a table of science; none of that is any different from what you would expect from say a Hindu Guru or a Zoroastrian priest when his faith and vision of the world is questioned! And if this attitude and behavior does not exhibit a phenomenon of **strong faith** and a total commitment to it, with a clear readiness to maybe even go to as far as wage intellectual and political wars for its sake (like his calling American atheists to arms?); then I wonder, what is faith?

As for me, as a man who admits his faith and is proud to argue for it, and to even fight for it if he had to, I speak in this book not from the position of a scientist whose subject matter is probabilistic by nature, one who insists on appealing to scientific evidence, struggling with rational and linguistic necessities as he goes, for the sake of setting up his personal fundamental beliefs the way he likes them to be! I speak from the position of a man who is **certain** that he does have all the evidence that a sane man needs to see the truth for what it is! So when I accuse an offender of my faith of ignorance, I can easily prove to him that he is indeed ignorant and that he does not know the first thing about the book that he's refuting! But when an atheist charges all people of religion with ignorance, he knows pretty well there's nothing on his hands by which he can **prove** them all wrong at any level of indisputable argumentation!

Now, let's proceed with our response to this 'religious' campaign against reason and knowledge.

I quote:

> "*Some observed phenomenon - often a living creature or one of its more complex organs, but it could be anything from a molecule up to the universe itself - is correctly extolled as statistically improbable"* (Dawkins, p. 113)

Absolutely wrong! Statistical improbability does not apply to this problem! I do not look at a complex creature and say: how "probable" is it that something like this could come into being from nothingness, or from inanimate particles? It **does** exist indeed, (hence it is not *impossible*!) and it obviously cannot be anything but the outcome of a perfect process of informed and purposeful creation! I never saw **anything** come into being from nothingness, or inanimate matter turn into a living being (and the actual difference between a living being and a dead being is obviously not a question of chemistry!), so obviously the very first event that brought that thing into being, whatever it was, is something we've seen nothing like; and hence there's no place at all for applying statistical probability here as we explained earlier!

False application and conceptualization of mathematical tools always results in nothing but **bad science**!

I quote:

> *"In fact, as I shall show in this chapter, Darwinian natural selection is the only known solution to the otherwise unanswerable riddle of where the information comes from"* (Dawkins, p. 114)

In fact, as I hope my reader will be able to judge by the end of this literature; Darwinian natural selection is by no means a solution to anything, and the least it could ever do – in fact - is explain **where** all the *information* comes from!

> *"However statistically improbable the entity you seek to explain by invoking a designer, the designer himself has got to be at least as improbable. God is the Ultimate Boeing 747"*

Again we say: Our Lord Almighty is not a *created* creator! If we're talking about a "Created designer" that is bound (by the very meaning of being created) to the same laws that restrict all creation, then yes of course, it only makes sense that this creator be more improbable (too complex to have any similar match that may have ever come under the reach of human experience). But this is obviously not **The** creator we speak of, because

obviously it does not end the regress in the only rationally plausible way! So it is not "probable" or "improbable" that The Creator exists; it is **rationally necessary** that He Does!

> *"The argument from improbability states that complex things could not have come about by chance."*

It seems that I will not be able to proceed with my reading in (The God Delusion) without making a stop at almost every single statement! Now this statement is a trick of terminology! When I say that complex things **could not** have come around by chance, I'm not talking **probability**! I'm clearly saying that it's **impossible** for complex things to come about by chance.[14] It's impossible, not improbable, that any system would ever emerge into being as the outcome of an unplanned, unguided, unconditioned and purposeless event, not to mention a countless number of such events!

[14] Chance and purposelessness are only in the eye of the limited human beholder! They only describe our current model of things, not the way they really are. A process that had no doer (agent) and no purpose does not exist! It simply cannot **be**! Many things may appear in nature to be "functionless", but this doesn't make nature un-designed, and it doesn't mean it came about "randomly" or by chance! That's only a statement of current knowledge of a particular set of natural phenomena! Nature is a grand system that keeps unfolding its secrets to the limited reach of man's hand, and if there's any lesson that a scientist should learn from this gradual growth of human knowledge; this is it!

There are a countless number of things that scientists once used to think had no function in nature and had no guiding rule; and only further observation, examination and advancement at that, proved them wrong! What else did they expect anyway? In a perfectly purposeful and functional universe like the one we clearly live in, it's impossible that there be anything that is missing, or that is excess or functionless, or was not made for a particular purpose, regardless of how much we currently know about that function or purpose!

It really amazes me how a scientist could so easily challenge his own eyes and insist on nullifying the necessary perfectness of what can only be – rationally - the other end of a clearly perfect system! I mean if it is this perfect at one end, then how could it possibly be chaotic or unruly at the other? This makes no sense at all! It's basic reason and language here! This a dynamic system where every element has a track of different functions that it assumes through the course of time according to a perfect code of balanced progression! At any point of this progression, if anything is lacking then this only means failure! Even if a tiny grain of sand may appear now to do nothing but work as part of a soft walking carpet on the beach, tomorrow, some of its molecules may actually be part of the body of a whale, or even the body of one of your own grandchildren! This is a complete, closed (conserved) and perfectly balanced system where nothing is excess or has no function! Nothing could be more obvious and yet they insist on denying it!

Fundamental semantic corruption and Wordplay!

Quote:

> *But many people define 'come about by chance' as a synonym for 'come about in the absence of deliberate design'. Not surprisingly, therefore, they think improbability is evidence of design.*

Clearly, the way those "many people" define "chance" has nothing to do with any mistake of reason that they or anybody may make applying improbability or probability where it does not rationally apply! Anybody who thinks "improbability" proves or means anything at all in our query, is delusional, and does not properly understand what mathematical probability really means!

As for what chance is; that's another issue! However, to the author it is obviously the same issue! This is because he is making an extremely senseless case here, in trying to prove that what people may put in the claimed absence of a purposeful, knowing, willing creator, is **not** what they would have no choice but to call: "chance"! Well this is by all means a contradiction! It means that Order = chaos, because if order can emerge from chaos without a purposeful external originator (and organizer) that initiates and enforces the organizing rule that we would then recognize as order, then there really is no difference in meaning between "order" and "Chaos" at all, because what is chaos – linguistically - if not a state where nothing happens in any organized manner or for any plausible reason we can think of? I mean this is simple linguistic reasoning here! It's the necessary distinction between the very meaning of order and the meaning of chaos in any human language! This rational distinction is ultimately destroyed by Darwinian logic!

This is why Dawkins is uncomfortable with the only reasonable and sensible way to explain the word "chance"!

But let's consult a dictionary, shall we?

Chance:

"The absence of any cause of events that can be predicted, understood, or controlled…"

- " *The unknown and unpredictable element in happenings that seems to have no assignable cause.*
- *A force assumed to cause events that cannot be foreseen or controlled; luck: Chance will determine the outcome."*

(Middle English, *unexpected event*, from Old French, from Vulgar Latin *cadentia, from Latin cadēns, cadent-, present participle of cadere, *to fall, befall*; see kad- in Indo-European roots.)

(Source: chance. (n.d.). *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition*. Retrieved February 03, 2009, from Dictionary.com website:

http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/chance)

Thus we can see that chance is actually a relative meaning! That is to say, something may appear to have happened by chance in the eyes of one man, while another would **know** that it is all planned, like when X thinks he met Y by chance when in fact the meeting was all arranged by Y or by someone that neither X nor Y expects to have anything to do with it! It's all but a stance of relative human knowledge!

Thus, one should point out that man's current incapability of comprehending or predicting the cause beyond a given event in nature, does not by any means of reason, make that particular event or element without any cause or purpose or order! The problem is fundamentally epistemic not ontological as we can see! Absence of knowledge is not knowledge of absence! It is amazing how people who are supposed to have been exposed to all so many wonders of order and functionality in the way systems of nature work, and have been trained with rigorous scientific argumentation and theorization, would find it plausible to claim that within such a perfectly ordered system and such a delicate dynamic equilibrium; there could be elements that follow no rule, or have no particular purpose or function within this system! After all, it was only through our humble observation of this system itself that we learned to know what purpose and function are! Our minds work the way

they work, because nature is the way it is! It is the very reason there is such a thing in our knowledge that we call “natural law”!

Thus we say that the claim that there is intrinsic “lawlessness” somewhere in – not to mention at the very roots and origins of – this perfect system that cradles us; is fundamentally false! The words (chance) and (random) cannot afford these meanings they have given them; it is wrong language and anti-science position as we shall come to elaborate throughout this literature. It comes only from the shortsightedness of a stubborn atheist who insists on denying the undeniable, and placing disorder at the bottom of what is obviously a seamless fabric of perfect order!

The system is clearly made to accommodate and allow for such things that we cannot yet understand or explain, to take place the way they do, because if not; then it should’ve crashed and failed long ago! You cannot imagine what may happen in the universe if – say – the number of grains of sand existing in it was only a handful less or more than it is! We have only little knowledge of the infinitely complicated processes running in the universe of which this sand is – was and will be - a key element! Even the most “hazardous” and “unexplainable” events in nature, are parts of the way it is made and the way it runs! By creation it is made to – functionally and purposefully - allow for them the way we see them!

This is the frame of rational intuition than every healthy mind should work within, in seeking to model and explain the way this magnificent system works! This has always been the way with mankind and the way humans do science until at some late point in the history of the west, certain philosophers started to rebel against reason and knowledge itself! It was there that the positive became negative, and axioms of reason and language started to be put to the guillotine! And today, scientists can easily insert corruption and failure in the very system that gave them the meaning of order, beauty, function, time, and law, and not only get away with it; they even find themselves justified! Certain meanings that were only – rationally - used to describe the characteristically limited way by which we humans understand and explain nature; are now assigned to nature itself! This is a problem far more fundamental – in terms of philosophy – than most of

today's militant atheists (Dawkins, Dennett, Hitchens, Harris and others) could possibly realize! It is the reason why they think they stand justified in their counter-intuitive position! It is the reason why someone like Dawkins actually thinks – ironically enough – that he is raising people's "consciousness" with such a book!

The very fact that nature continues to run in perfect equilibrium with no crash or collapse, as perfectly suited for human life as it is, proves that nothing takes place or exists within it without a function, and a code of balance that when examined closely would tell us that it actually **had** to take place precisely the way it did, or exist precisely where it did when it did! A natural scientist who doesn't exhibit humility towards this amazing system that we call the universe; and instead he would seek to plant chaos and chance in the middle – even at the bottom - of it; is a man who is in deliberate rejection of what he knows he cannot deny! This is what we call in Islam (Juhood جحود defiance)!

When mathematicians first pondered on what they now call (Chaos mathematics) they were motivated by the need to reconsider the way they viewed many phenomena as "disorder" or just "noise" that followed no particular rule or pattern, and could not be fit within the linear code of mathematical expression. They came up with a model that is more of a conjectural attempt to plot or model the way a system "looks" or "behaves", in an expression that is deterministic, but yet leaves room for the unpredictability that characterizes many parts of that system (in the view of man). They simply developed a mathematical model (a set of rules) that simulates in its unpredictable outcome, the way we observe many complex systems in nature.

And even though they cannot afford to deny the rationally necessary – and clearly evident – determinism and consistency within any system in study (like climatic and weather systems for example) and in the way it relates to all other determinate systems in nature, you would still find them confused about the philosophical meaning of (Chaos) in this context of theory nonetheless! Chaos in this context is only an expression of unpredictability and nonlinearity in the way we seek to model such unimaginably complex

systems; it doesn't mean that the system lacks any masterfully determined rules! It wouldn't work if it did! As unpredictable to man as those phenomena may be; the system is clearly organized in perfect accordance and equilibrium with such phenomena nonetheless! There are forces that we know we cannot comprehend or predict in our current state of knowledge – as fundamental components of the system as they actually are -, yet scientists would so easily dismiss them as random and just plain "noise", in the sense that there is no determinate law in nature to control them! It is here that the atheistic philosophy of science goes wrong! And while we hold that every single part of this magnificent system must be perfectly created for a purpose, regardless of how much of that we may currently or may ever come to know, atheists on the other hand would easily put chaos 'in the gaps'; the very antonym of system and natural law itself!

So the problem is indeed a radical problem of epistemology! It manifests in this line the distinguishes between the way man comprehends and models nature by his limited human tools of knowledge on one hand, and the way it really is, on the other! It is often neglected – this line - or even erased by the pompous and arrogant approach of atheists to the understanding of nature. And thus we can't help wondering: If whatever we don't see is not there, and whatever we cannot comprehend is just "chance" or "chaos" in its very nature, then why are we still doing science at all? The very progress of science itself from one age of man to the other refutes this corrupt approach, and exposes it as an actual escape from the 'bigger questions'!

So this is how it works for an atheist: Those parts of nature the orderliness of which serves his belief about the reason he's here; are orderly and perfectly systematic, whereas those parts the perfectness of which suggests the fallacy of his belief in the reason why he's here, and thus endangers his fate after death because of his choice of belief regarding it; have to be chaotic and unorganized by nature! And thus, God has to be a delusion! Let him then be reminded that what was yesterday chaotic and functionless, is today known for a fact to be a necessary functional part of more than one system and subsystem in nature! Let him be reminded of his limits as a human who is

only beginning to learn a little part of a little part of the very little that he can currently see of this magnificent system that we call the universe!

In our blindness and shortsightedness we humans have been bombing, cutting, exterminating, polluting the seas, damaging the atmosphere, causing the extinction of many species for so long, and yet the system continues to be perfectly fit for our miserable kind to live and to do what they are here to do! It is made in such a way as to absorb the "stupidity", arrogance, and sheer blindness of humans, and balance those relatively limited damages and add them to the negative side of its continually balanced scale! Many atheists would look at certain events of natural catastrophe and claim them to demonstrate the lack of order and control in the system! They are blind to the bigger picture, and they forget that in order to make such a judgment they have to build upon verifiable knowledge of the exact detailed purpose or function for which those elements of life exist the way they do! The very notions of system, subsystem and functional composition did not come to us from anywhere but the careful observation and examination of this world around us! So by what wisdom do they seek to project our human ignorance unto this system itself, its purpose and the necessary functionality of its every part? If I don't know what a Watch is made for, by what reason do I give myself the right to judge it as purposeless or defective?

Atheists just need to sit down, and realize that we humans are only ants dancing on the tip of the tail of a huge elephant! And while every reasonable and sensible man would find this overwhelming magnificence and vast richness of the universe an unmistakable sign to the grandeur and mastery of its maker, atheists on the other hand would claim it to indicate that contrary to what the three religions teach, man is too small to be of any significance in the vast universe! And instead of fueling fear and humility in their hearts as it naturally does; they take it to indicate that life on this tiny earth must have came about by chance! They'd look to the sky and claim in arrogance that if the world was indeed specifically suited for man's life, then the creator couldn't possibly have any purpose in making the universe so unimaginably vast, with so many cosmic events happening in places so far away that we humans will never get any chance to observe them!

The point is; atheists have taken it for a faith to steadily and forcefully deny that the picture is far too big and too perfect for any man to dare call any part of it “chaotic” or “purposeless”!

And again; chaos is only a relative expression of something that we humans have no knowledge of a similar pattern of order in our minds to analogize it to! You enter your kid’s room and see things thrown around randomly and you say: This is chaos! Yes it is, but in that, you are making a reference of analogy to a particular notion or image that you have of what “order” you expect to see! This comes from your previous knowledge of the way your kid normally places things in the room, or the way he is supposed to do that anyway! Those books should not be on the bed, that shirt should not be hanging on the back of the chair, the chair itself should not block the door, the pillow should be aligned with the edge of the bed, the sheet should not be wrinkled, but should be stretched to cover the bed evenly … etc! Whenever you miss any of those patterns of what you call order (relative human notion), you see chaos and disorder instead! You know (according to a previous plan and purpose that defines this particular system) that this is not the way it should be! But is this the case with natural phenomena? When you see certain phenomena that do not fit by analogy to any model that you previously knew or expected to see; do you have the right to call it “disorder” or “chaos” in the sense that it cannot be intended just as it is by its creator? No of course you don’t! Because quite clearly, the overarching system where this phenomenon is observed to take place, is far more consistent and determinate in the way it is ordered and run than what your kid does to his room! And obviously enough, you do not possess a frame of reference of previous knowledge about the exact purpose of creation of those phenomena and thus the exact way they have to be in order for the system to work as it should!

The system is perfect and complete in itself; only we are too limited to grasp it! Yes we are growing more knowledgeable with time, but we must admit our limits!

In their arrogance, atheists would look at earlier ages of man – within the documented history of mankind – and view the current advancement of

sciences that they now possess, as evidence to the mental primitiveness of humans in those earlier ages! They would even use it as additional evidence to further support Darwinian "evolution"! This is sheer blindness that builds upon the very same fundamental problem, because even the most intelligent human being in our current time will probably come up with no bigger solutions, inventions or discoveries than the smartest of them could, if he were to start from the exact same point where they started! A genius tribesman living in some "secluded" tribe in the Amazons today – not by necessity in the past – is not expected, as I gave this example earlier in this literature, to come up with the invention of a chainsaw – much less a laser cutting device – when he is faced with the problem of cutting down a tree! I mean it would be a "*miracle*" if he did, wouldn't it? He does not have even one tenth of the input of knowledge and technology that the Chainsaw inventor had! So his solution to the problem will naturally be much simpler!

It must be clear that this gradual advancement of civilization is the well expected outcome of a gradual accumulation of knowledge from "simple to complex", not of a gradual "evolution" in human organic or mental capacity from "primitive" to "evolved"! This confusion so easily encourages those who believe in their 'hominid' ancestry, and who are blinded by the "glories" of our time, to look down on earlier times and ages of humanity as times of lesser minds in less evolved primates!

What some of those minds (only the atheists among them) may have once thought to have no governing order; is now known to have its laws and rules! And it is likely that this is exactly the same thing that our grandchildren will say about us, and about the way our scientists look today at many phenomena of nature! "Oh! They called *this* 'chaos'?!"

Physicists are now working in attempt to come up with what they call: "the theory of everything" or the "final theory" [15]! One has to wonder then, is this not a contradiction that you would call certain patterns in nature "chaotic", and "random" and yet you still recognize the necessity of there being a single unified law or order that runs it all? I'm not examining the particular

[15] The idea that man could one day come up with anything that could qualify as "final" in terms of theorization in natural sciences is by all means a childish dream!

types of phenomena that physicists address when they speak of a theory of "everything", or the way they think this theory could be expressed or used, I'm examining the underlying reason there; the common sense that no matter how random anything in this world may appear to be in the limited (relativistic) uninformed human eye; nothing in nature is at random, and nothing is free from a necessary binding law or code of control that runs the entire system!

Thus we can now see what a grave assault on nature (not to mention its creator) it really is to assign the meaning of "chance" or "Chaos" not to our limited understanding of certain elements of it, but to the way those elements are in reality! Darwinian reasoning moves it from being a statement of a relative lack of human knowledge of the governing rule and the exact function or purpose of a phenomenon (which is its actual linguistic meaning), to a statement of random purposelessness that is characteristic of the phenomenon itself!

AS Darwinian, Dawkins is claiming life to have emerged without any previously determined course "plan", purpose, or intent! By pure accident! Initially random and chaotic! It is utterly ridiculous how he makes a distinction between "a series of chance events" and a single act of chance, as we shall elaborate; and based on nothing but "probability"! We will show him that even when we apply his probabilistic conception, this "mount improbable" story could be good for nothing but a fairy tale!

Even if we accepted this "series of chance events" that he claims, he still has to answer to how and why any form of governing order at all could possibly emerge in a chaotic unguided uncontrolled medium! He still has to explain how any act of "chance" – according to his terminology – could possibly produce any form of self-maintained order or anything that could even be called "process", order, or rule at all, without any initial preparation or any previously determined target and purpose!

My point here is that, not only is Darwinism an abuse of mathematical and scientific terminology, it is an abuse of language itself! Just as it is the case

with any false system of faith! It relies upon false **meanings** and profound semantic errors, all the way down to the core!

It is really astonishing how they keep using the words “designed”, “planned”, “selected”, “controlled” and so forth, - like all healthy humans do - in explaining what natural selection “does” (according to Darwinism), and yet insist on the claim that this is nothing but a linguistic confusion that all humans are suffering from! A natural norm and basis of human reasoning and linguistic expression, is so boldly rendered as a mere common mistake or delusion that man is supposed to cure himself from! We all – all humans other than Darwinians of course - suffer from the “irrational inclination” to call nature “designed” (created) when in reality it is – in a term so ridiculously coined by Dawkins – only “designoid”![16] **When you say “selected” then you naturally, and in all proper linguistic usages, and by all means of reason, mean to say “by someone” or “by a selector”**; don’t you?! There’s no “selected by no selector” or “done by no doer”! Human reason (not intuition or gut feeling as they would often maintain) rejects this meaning as a fallacy, a contradiction! Now they would say: “we do not mean

[16] I must point out that even the very use of the word “design” as ascribed to the work of the Lord Almighty is – In Islam – improper! This is because the first meaning that comes to the mind of the listener when he hears the word “design” is: “to prepare the preliminary sketch or the plans for (a work to be executed), esp. to plan the form and structure of: to design a new bridge”!

(Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1). Retrieved May 01, 2009, from Dictionary.com website: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/design)

This is the first meaning in a list of four or five meanings in the dictionary! All five of those meanings when applied, give the sense of a work of previous preparation and study that man has to do before he creates anything! This particular kind of “preparation” is actually NOT to be attributed to the Lord! It is – in man – a feature of his human limitedness. The Lord on the other hand, never needed to ***study***, ***test***, or ***try and err*** (natural components of what we call: human design) before He commenced with creation (omniscience)! Thus, the word design in this human sense is not to be attributed to the Lord almighty! However, if all we mean by it is the previous determination, intent, will, and knowledge of creation by a willful and capable creator prior to the act of creation, then it may be attributed to Him only in this context of discussion. This is why I must draw the reader’s attention to the fact that only within this context may I make use of such terms (design, plan … etc.) in describing the Lord’s work, because as a rule, Allah is only to be described by attributes revealed in authentic scripture! I must also make sure that the reader understands that whatever deeds we attribute to the Lord, they are – by default in our faith – to be taken as un-analogous, and incomparable in how they are, in any way, to human attributes and human deeds. It’s our rule of thumb in dealing with God’s attributes.

that something did any "selection", we call it natural because if a certain set of genes just happens to work well, then it will survive, while others that don't will fail and perish! It is "selected" only in this sense!" One can easily reply to that saying: "But this ***is*** selection and it implies – by necessity – determinism: a previous plan and a '*selection algorithm*'! It necessitates a previously determined rule that defines what works (fits) and what doesn't! Because if only certain individuals with particular qualities and genetic traits are to survive in this world while all others would perish: this has no other meaning in language but "selection" according to a previously determined rule! Darwin could not afford to call it anything else! If atheists could escape the use of this language they certainly would, but they just couldn't! It's the way our minds are hardwired! Whether they like it or not, this meaning necessitates the action of a **selector**, a doer of the selection, whose informed and previously determined code is the rule by which something is to be "selected"!

When they use the parable of the key and the lock, they would suggest that different keys kept coming out (at random), incapable of opening the lock, until finally, and all by pure chance, a particular key appeared that worked: This is when we say it was *naturally selected*! Now I will simply say: But what about the lock itself, and the conditions and features that should characterize its only working key? What about the factory that branded those keys, not to mention the one that designed the lock? Did the lock come to be without a maker who defines its function and the only way it could be unlocked? Did all that – too – come about by natural selection? What is the source of those codes: the key-lock code, and the random generator of keys? The system of nature itself in which what fits is selected and what doesn't is not, where did it come from in the first place; and where did its codes and laws (without which evolution couldn't possibly start) come from?

This is why no matter how hard you try, my atheist reader, you cannot escape using the word "design" or the word "selected", the very use of which necessitates to a willful agent that performs this selection according to its purpose and its rules!

I was amazed, actually overwhelmed by the sheer wonders of creation, richness and perfectness that Dawkins displayed to the audience in one of his Royal institute Christmas lectures (the second lecture in the series titled: *Growing up in the universe*!), in his outrageous attempt to argue that none of those wonders is created (designed) at all! In fact, I say if I were to search for some of the most exquisite and sublime examples of how perfect this creator really is, I couldn't have thought of any more dazzling examples than those he displayed to the audience in that particular lecture, calling them all nothing but "designoid objects"! Actually, I can think of no better presentation to destroy Darwinism itself! With very little commentary, it may be very well used for this purpose! It's amazing how a man could be so blindly stubborn in his false position that he would gather some of the most overwhelming signs of perfect creation; to actually present them in argument *against* creation! This is why it is true that debating an atheist is never fruitful, and there's always very little hope that he would listen; because his position is really not a conviction based on rational evidence; it's a stubborn denial of the validity of the very way healthy reason works, and a challenge to the very way we humans use language!

He admits in this lecture and in many other occasions that he finds sheer difficulty in keeping his tongue (having to bite it!) from using this word, "design", when he speaks of such wonders! Well, he can't escape it no matter what! Yet, it doesn't even draw the slightest hint in the minds of his followers that perhaps he is the one who's being delusional here, trying to deny one of the most undeniable meanings a man is actually built to see and express! I really wonder; how can they even sleep at night?

In that lecture he says:

> *"What do they all have in common those designed objects? They are all good for some purpose, and they couldn't have come to be the way they are by luck!"*
>
> *("Design and Designoid objects":*

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xGyh1Qsw-Ak&ap=%2526fmt%3D18&feature=PlayList&p=ED4BA3683D0273ED&index=1)

I say; then by what reason do you dare call a crystal "simple" or "un-designed", simply because you don't know why it is the way it is?

If we're talking about a manmade artifact, then certainly we KNOW its purpose! We designed it for that purpose! So we can easily judge it! But when it comes to living things, organs, natural systems, and so forth, we are only seeking to **learn** about the function and the purpose for which they are made; we do not define that purpose on our own, it doesn't come from us; we only seek to obtain knowledge of it, to fit it in its right place in the big picture, so to speak!

So when you state that only those things that are good for a purpose could qualify as "designed", one has to ask, what about a natural system the purpose of which you still do not know? Does this make it qualify as un-designed? That crystal, if you could discover the role it plays (as unfamiliar or un-analogous its shape may look in its natural context) and you could see how distinct it is in nature from many other equally purposeful and functional compositions of other inanimate forms of matter in the universe, and the impact they have on the way life progresses on earth; would you still find it reasonable to deny the fact that it must be "designed", for a purpose that it serves in perfectness?

You may think you "know" the origin of life on Earth, but what about the origin of the Earth itself? Those rocks, that huge variety of types of inanimate matter (metals, nonmetals, lanthanides, silicates, minerals, inert gases; etc.), where did all that variety come from, and what is it for? All are parts of an extremely complicated and perfectly balanced system that we call the universe, a system that progresses through time changing the immediate function of every element within it in a long series of compositions and decompositions that serve the very purpose for which the whole thing was created. And while we – healthy humans - never fail to be overwhelmed and

humbled by the way nature works, some people insist on attributing this mastery to billions of years of chaos!

Darwinians are indeed so shortsighted that they cannot see that if inanimate matter is the substance from which all living beings are built; then at the very least, this should be part of the purpose for which this variety in matter itself exists! Part of the purpose why a particle identified as a carbon atom has to exist in the way it does, in distinction from a hydrogen atom for example! If without water there could be no life; then this must be part of the function of water itself, of the reason why there is water in the world! So why speak of gills – for example - as a purposeful and functional organ in fish, but think no more of water – that mysterious life-blood liquid – than a purposeless or functionless liquid that is just "there because it's there"?

What about a piece of rock? What's the function of that? Well, imagine if I cut off the brains of some beast, and put it in front of you, when you have no idea what that thing was before it was chopped off! Would you dare say it has no function? Regardless of whether or not you may afterwards use it for some new purpose of your own, maybe even cook it and eat it; the fact remains that it was indeed part of another system and had its own function there, one that was not given to it by you! So that crystal rock in your hands, was – in its natural ecosystem – part of a bigger system where crystal compositions, with those amounts in particular, with that crystalline pattern in particular, even with those shapes and formations in specific, had their specific function and place in the system! Once you chop them off, the function changes! So speaking of purpose; your ignorance does not make this piece of rock purposeless as it was or even as it is! [17] I couldn't help

[17] Learning from the knowledge of Islam we know that the Lord has created everything on earth for the purpose of testing man; we can understand that the function of a rock and its place in the system may change when you cut it and start adapting it for your own use, but this does not change its purpose of creation! It is only a part of the detailed purpose of its creation. It is made as such to do a certain job before it is cut, and to be subject to your intent and do another job after it is cut, and another after it breaks, and so on! Somewhere in your body, there is a molecule of carbon that may have one day been part of the body of an elephant or a fly, or even a tree trunk! It is now part of a different system, doing a different immediate function! Both functions were not assigned to it by you; but by the creator and sustainer of the system and all its parts, the very one who determines *your* function in the world as a human being; praised be!

laughing when he pointed in that lecture at a piece of rock that was shaped "by accident" in such a way that it looks like a pot; he actually measured its efficiency for the job of a pot, and made the conclusion that since it's not designed then it's natural that its efficiency as a pot should be very low! The man says it himself: Though it looks like a pot, it is not made as such for the purpose of working as a pot! So how possibly could it be called un-designed, only because it's not working properly **as a pot**? It's certainly not designed to be a pot, that's clear! But does this mean that it is not designed at all? You did not make it in this way for your own purpose; does this mean that it was not made for any purpose at all? Well, let me disappoint you professor and tell you that in fact, this particular rock was made by its creator to look this way for the particular purpose – among other purposes - that one day some atheist would take it for an example in a public lecture to show that nothing in nature has any purpose or is designed at all!

When he pointed to the microscope on his desk in that lecture he said:

> *"Most certainly it couldn't have come about by luck! If you take a lot of atoms and shake them up at random, then you may get a crystal, but you will not in a billion billion billion years get a microscope!"*

I say: no you may not! Not in a billion billion billion years could you get a crystal if you did that! Not unless you make certain settings, preparations and adjustments of conditions all for the specific end of making a crystal! In fact, even the scandalously silly image of you shaking atoms in a box – for example – is itself the previous preparation of some form of a closed medium prepared deliberately for a specific purpose: a plan, a goal!: The plan of obtaining something, whatever it is as an output from the input of those atoms! There always has to be a well conditioned force, posed beforehand, that would – at least – keep binding those atoms to continue bombarding one another (at random), long enough for anything at all to start taking place!

It is thus amazing how he finds it impossible to end up with a microscope in a billion billion billion years of shaking atoms in a closed controlled medium, but on the other hand, he claims that only in less than four billion

years of time, could living beings that are billions of times more complicated than a microscope (like a snake), emerge starting off from no purpose, no conditioned or prepared medium, and nothing at all, and progress by successive unplanned acts of chance! Is this not a contradiction?

If I applied simple proportion here, then I should actually expect something as compound as a microscope, to come out of some "process" similar to natural selection in its "chance steps", in relatively no time at all! If a snake is one billion times more complicated than a microscope – according to Dawkins' rhetoric in the lecture – and it evolved within some hundred and twenty billion years, then something as compound as a microscope may very well "evolve" on its own in little over a century! Just do the Math! Furthermore, in the microscope example, there will be two hands governing the medium for "chaotic mechanisms" to take place (the hands shaking the atoms I mean); but in nature, no such medium was governed or deterministically maintained (according to Darwinism)! So perhaps it will take just a few decades or something! I mean, assuming the rational validity of natural selection, why not presume the possibility of emergence of some similar chance mechanism to it that may end up "selecting" that microscope in a few decades?!

"Not in a billion billion billion years" he says!

Why? Because you **know** the purpose of the microscope, but you think the snake has none at all? Is this the difference?

Well, it is obviously not just irrational; it is a billion billion billion times worse than irrational that he would still insist on calling a snake: "designoid" and bite his tongue every time he calls it design, or even whenever he calls it a "creature" for that matter!

This is indeed an assault on language itself!

Imagine somebody who tells you: when people speak of the sky, they should not say it's blue, it only *appears as though* it were blue in color when in fact it is not: It is only "blueoid"! What would you say to that? Well, I say, this is nothing but "reasonoid"! "Languageoid" also comes to mind!

Now what do you expect would be the consequences of proving to people that their natural understanding of language and their natural reasoning of different meanings is so fundamentally corrupt? What would it sound like if somebody argued – for example - that all English Grammar in all English books is false, or that half of the words we commonly use in our everyday language mean exactly the opposite to what we all take them to mean? It is indeed an offense, and should be treated as such!

Thus I say it is amazing indeed – and truly disappointing I should say - that this author here is examining some arguments by philosophers thinking that by destroying them, he will have disproven the rational inevitability of a perfect creator! They would so arrogantly say: “prove to me that there is a creator”! Well, I can say no more in reply than: “Prove to me that you are human or that you are intelligent, not to mention that you have a mind at all”!

The burden of proof is not on a man who applies straight axiomatic reasoning and natural linguistic expression on one of the clearest meanings ever known to man! It is on those who deny it, defy their very own tongues to fight it, and seek to render it as nothing but a “delusion”! And oh what a burden that is!

They are attempting to block the natural process of human identification of meanings to take place on what is actually the most worthy observable thing in existence of being called “designed” or “planned” or “created”! This is by all means one of the greatest assaults on language and linguistic reason man has ever known! I have seen many cults of religion playing games with words (as all preachers of false religions actually do), twisting their meanings against what every reasonable man should understand, but I have never to this day, seen a “cult” as bold in defying their very own tongues as the Darwinians!

Just look at the title of Dawkins’ book “*The blind watchmaker*”: How possibly could a watchmaker be blind? This is exactly what Darwinism is all about! This is what its preachers are trying so hard to have you believe: That a watch could indeed be made by a blind watchmaker! That Nature is

perfectly ordered and perfectly contained and controlled, but do not be fooled: This is not done by any knowledgeable or capable willful power as a human mind is so "*tempted*" to *deduce*! It's made by no willful maker! It's made but not made! It's designed but not designed! It's controlled but not controlled! There is a maker (or a governing agent) but he (it) is blind, purposeless, plan-less, and so pathetically incapable that he – or it – does not know what it's doing, does not know anything at all, does not have any plan, and yet it's "doing" it anyway; and perfectly well to say the least!

Designing …

Selecting …

Controlling …

Governing …

But all this is just "semantic" delusion; because in reality nobody and nothing is doing anything at all!

What is this?!

By what standards of reason could we even begin to debate with such a rational and linguistic outrage? We can't! There's no point trying to convince a man to open his eyes if he wishes to see properly! No point at all!

I can find some common grounds of reason when I debate with a man who believes in God and His prophets, but thinks of Him as both one and three at the same time; I mean, after all, at least he admits the undeniable: That he himself was created! But what can I do with a man who actually thinks that his very own tongue and his very own mind; are tricking him? To him, I am – and so is the rest of mankind - delusional no matter what I say!

Look at other titles of Dawkins' publications!

The book "The *selfish* genes" for example is written to actually convince people that genes *created* all life, and have been "working" as though they are "selfish" but in fact they're not! They have no intent or will or plan or anything at all! They work for the sake of preserving their phenotypes, have

been doing so for billions of years, yet there is no plan or purpose of any kind anywhere and nothing is actually "*doing*" anything! They are in full control of the system running all life for their own favor and survival, when in fact they are not! They control but they don't; we're only tempted to think so! They plan, but they don't; they only appear as though they do! They "come up with perfect solutions" by means of a process called natural selection, when in fact they're nothing but blind, dead matter! How do those people really believe themselves?!

In a book with such a title, it's no surprise to find statements as such:

> *"We are survival machines—robot vehicles **blindly programmed to preserve** the **selfish** molecules known as genes…" (Preface of the 1976 edition)*

Programmed? By what? "Selfish" molecules? Oh Bite your tongue atheist! You **do not** mean that!

> *"The argument of this book is that we, and all other animals, are machines **created by** our genes…" (The Selfish Gene, p. 13)*

How could X create Y when X is only a small component of Y; one that cannot be anything at all but dead matter without Y? X cannot have come into being as an X, without a Y that defines its function, so how could X be the **creator** of Y?

But then again, he should bite his tongue here as well… maybe "created" is not the right word?! What then? What's the right word?

> *"This entitles us to expect certain **qualities** in our genes."* (ibid, p. 13)

How about; "attributes"? Well, they are indeed attributes … look at this:

> *"I shall argue that a predominant quality to be expected in a **successful** gene is **ruthless selfishness**…."(ibid, p. 14)*

> *"However, as we shall see, there are special circumstances in which a gene **can achieve its own selfish goals** best by **fostering** a limited form of **altruism** at the level of individual animals…."(ibid, p. 14)*

> "*Let us understand* ***what our own selfish genes are up to****, because we may then at least have the chance* ***to upset their designs****, something that no other species has ever aspired to….*" *(ibid, p. 14)*

But if we did upset their "designs"; then all natural life would perish, wouldn't it? I mean if those designs where good for anything at all, then upsetting them is not a very wise thing to do, is it? So I wonder how that "epic rebellious struggle" he dreams of between man and his own "evil" genes would end! Extinction and Doom, obviously, not for man alone, but for all natural life! (The atheistic version of the "End Times" and doomsday, perhaps?) It then turns out that it may have been much better if those "foolish genes" never "gave" man a mind at all, and that man – because of nothing but his very mind itself - is the most stupid species of all! I wonder, how those genes "could" survive those "billions of years" so masterfully, facing all challenges, natural hazards and risks, and end up making such a stupid mistake: giving a particular species the very tool to blast the whole thing off! How many similar mistakes and "unexpected anomalies" such "unwise, unintelligent" designers should be very likely to have faced along such an extremely long span of time that should be sufficient to blast the whole thing away! Yet it persists, and lives all the way to meet its final chapter on the hands of this "lucky" species: The species that finally grew up to become a challenge!

Please my kind reader, revise these quotations and tell me that the professor doesn't actually mean any of this, and that those meanings do not give a reasonable man the model of an intelligent being (genes) that has those particular attributes in doing what it does! And then tell me if this is not what he means (and he will certainly argue that he doesn't mean it literally): then what on Earth does he mean? And what kind of cheap wordplay is this?

I recall now what Christopher Hitchens once said about all religions having a built-in code of global destruction and a longing to eternity, and to what is there beyond this life! I ask him then, do you not long yourself to see this system challenged; those genes tamed and controlled by man; and a new era of human mastery above the entire universe where eternity is made here in this world where people have finally vanquished death and decay, and it all

becomes a “paradise” once and for good, free from that “evil plan” that Genes have plotted for their own favor? You know this is impossible because the system is clearly built on decay and decomposition, on mortality and death, yet you dream it nonetheless! Are you dreaming of the final demise of mankind?

The myth – in this way –is too upsetting even for Dawkins’ own ambitions! He says the truth doesn’t have to be “happy”! Well, I say if “the truth” to him and his followers is all but a theory of biology in the end, and this miserable fiction here is **it**; then why not make it a “happy” theory?

Even Greek mythology sounds far more convenient indeed; at least there’s some meaning into it! Can’t you think of any more “hopeful” ending? Like for examples, the coming of a “half-man, half-gene” mutation (a man who can control genes?) that leads Earth to salvation from this “selfish” plan that runs it? Or maybe a good alien society comes to take over Earth, and rid mankind from those *evil genes* by means of some fancy super technology, and turn our planet into a utopia? Or perhaps, the genes themselves would quarrel, and some of them would turn into “good genes” and start favoring man in his struggle against the “selfish”” ones? Wouldn’t that be something? How about that for a happy ending? Nothing is easier than writing fiction, indeed!

Man cannot escape the necessity of answering the question: “Why”, “what’s the meaning of life?” “What is it for?” “Who brought me into it and why?” Obviously man cannot avoid the recognition of his being so privileged in this world for something, for some job, some correspondingly privileged purpose that does indeed demand the wise use of this mind, and of those skills that no other species on Earth possesses! However, as a materialist atheist, he finds himself incapable of explaining this fact! So for a Darwinist, who believes not in a deity or in the afterlife, Dawkins here is trying – blindly - to assume the position of a priest and fill the gap that only religious knowledge (be it true or false) – or manmade philosophy – is naturally used to fill! He’s writing his own “scripture” now; his own prophecy; yet he – so easily – calls it “science”! You now have some alternate “deity” (Genes), attributes to it (selfishness, ruthlessness, evil … etc.), a prophet (Darwin), a

holy book ("Origin of species", along with "the selfish genes" maybe?), a purpose (upsetting the Genes' plans, and rebelling against their blind control), and a system of morals (self indulgence and self-fulfillment by doing instinctively good deeds)! What more of a religion do you want? So let go of whatever faith you ever had, and take this one instead, if you wish to join the league of the elites of "science"!

> *"Our genes may* ***instruct us to be selfish****, but we are not necessarily compelled* ***to obey them*** *all our lives." (ibid, p. 15)*

Well we certainly should not build them a temple (or use some Darwinian labs!) like some worshippers of "Genes" may yearn to do, and rank you high priest there! However, whatever you do, be warned, people… Do not upset the almighty "Genes" or they will give you mutated disfigured children! Or maybe not! It appears they created us only to rebel against them! It's much more self-gratifying this way, isn't it?! After all, what "fun" would there be in blind submission to blind genes?

They ***made us*** only to reproduce ***for their favor***, and we enjoy the ability to choose not to! They ***designed us*** to be limited ***by their own selfish will*** for their own progress, and we are working on ***challenging them*** and manipulating the human genome at our free will! They ***limited us*** by aging and decay, but we are on our way to upset the "death" phenomenon itself once and for all!

How glorious indeed!

I can hardly keep from laughing!

And in his sheer pride, he thinks he has effectively ridiculed all religious deities and cults!

Yes of course he does not take those meanings seriously, but that's exactly my point here! **No matter what he does, he cannot escape the ascription of deeds and attributes to a willful creator!**

I challenge the professor to attempt to rewrite such phrases as the ones I quoted here ***without*** the use of such words, and to rename that book without

the use of the attribute "Selfish" altogether. Well, he has no possible way of doing this! He cannot convey the meaning he wishes to deliver to us in any other words! The core argument and the very purpose of the book will be destroyed if he keeps from using the word "Selfish"!

The process – in order to be called a process to begin with - must have a planner, a purposeful and willful planner that knows what he's doing and for what end, an agent to which attributes that are similar in meaning – and in meaning only - to human attributes, are to be ascribed by necessity of language and reason! That designer and His will, define our very purpose and the meaning of our existence in this world!

There's no escaping that! The very title "*the Selfish Genes*" proves just this! This title is obviously not *science*, and the subject matter of the book is definitely not a question that a Biologist could answer at any level of validity!

What he does in that book is not falsify this fact, he's actually making it much clearer than he could possibly imagine; and in a pathetic way I should add! It's like saying: If there must be a purposeful creator, from whose will we obtain the meaning and purpose of our lives, and if those meanings are indeed inescapable to the human notion; then why call this "creator" those names you call "it", and give "it" those attributes you believe in? There's no need to think of it as the truth "out there"; it's all "in here"! Take this story instead! The story of the "Selfish Genes"! See if it works for you!

I need not quote anything more from that book (The selfish genes); for I don't think he would have much left of a tongue to "bite" on if I did!

Again I know he will argue that this is only a metaphor, a figure of speech, and that he does not mean to ascribe any "attributes" in the sense that religions do to God! However, how can we believe him when the core meaning and belief that the book presents is a particular *'plan for an end'*, that genes have supposedly been running in natural life ever since the living cell originated, one that is clearly much bigger than being the mere code of copying and keeping of characteristics of different species? The book speaks of a role that is far bigger than the fact that general traits of a certain species

do propagate from one generation to the next via the genes! The message of the book is a clear "***selfish plan***", one that has been maintained over millions of years by those genes!

What are genes anyway? Those genes in my body are in reality nothing but a complex composition of molecules that came to be part of my body through nutrition and respiration in addition to heritance! Every cell that is born in our bodies emerges with an exact copy of the gene code making up its genes; genes are not external to this process; they are parts of it! **They do not copy themselves; they are *copied* by an external agent!** Are we supposed to believe now that genes are selfish agents that have been running the entire process of natural life for a selfish end? Sure enough this is not what Dawkins believes! So why does he have to write such a book?

If there's an ongoing will or plan that has been keeping the system all along – and there quite obviously is – then it certainly comes from an external source to those molecules and cells and the way they are made to run!

But that's exactly what Dawkins strives to deny, isn't it?! Thus there has to be "a selfish gene" story; a religious myth furnished with the constant reminder that design is not design, selection is not done by a selector, the genes are dead matter with no will and though they act selfishly, they really don't act at all and cannot be selfish… etc.!

Just look at the words he keeps using over and over, building his entire belief upon them! Not only is there a planner; but a selfish ruthless one as well! The genes in Dawkins' new religion are not programs made for a particular purpose; they are both **the program and the programmer, simultaneously**! A blind, selfish one for that matter, according to his own words!

The point is, no matter how hard he tries to fight it, the rationally necessary and natural human conclusion of a willful purposeful powerful "doer", creator and sustainer beyond this process cannot be escaped! And this is exactly why no matter how hard he tries; he will never manage to escape the use of such words! He will never manage to escape the necessary ascription

of what he may call "human-like" attributes! It's against the very way our minds, our tongues and our very souls are built, to think of it in any other way!

Now, look at the title "*Climbing Mount Improbable*"! One can't help but wonder: Who's climbing? Is this not a purpose? Is this not a "deed", by a willful, determinate doer, aiming at an end that could not be – by any code of proper reason – viewed as anything but part of a previous willful plan, or a long maintained program of some sort, one that in itself has to be "designed" and coded?

We cannot help but respond in such a way, not because we are delusional! Not because we see things, or do not sleep well, or suffer from some psychopathic symptoms! But because this nonsense is so profoundly false and irrational that one doesn't really know where to begin to refute it!

In that "Christmas lecture" cited above, Dawkins speaks of what he calls "simple" objects, to which he gives the example of a piece of rock or crystal! By that he makes it a statement of knowledge and fact that those things are in themselves and in their composition; **simple**! But what does he mean by "simple"?! I ask him this because as soon as scientific examination tools progress, things that were once thought to be simple, prove to be quite complex indeed! Just look at the way the first historical model of the structure of an atom was sketched, and look at what we know today about the subatomic (mind-maze)! How silly and blind is a man who would speak so blindly of the atom at the end of the nineteenth century and describe it as "simple"?! He would look at the simple two-dimensional diagram sketched at the time and say: "it is simple! There's a nucleus in the middle and a circular orbit for electrons rotating around it! Where's the complexity in that?" Well, he's right! There's no complexity in **that**! But is this what an atom is like in reality? Far from it!

Yes of course a piece of crystal – note: a piece; split and cut off its original system – is apparently far less "complex" than the subatomic structure, or than any living being for that matter! But isn't it, in itself, made of atoms and subatomic particles? If by simple they mean functionless or purposeless

or un-designed, as a statement of what this thing really is, not of what we currently know about its structure; they are indeed fostering an arrogant blindness as a belief in the name of science!

Thus it is clearly a far more fundamental problem with atheism and Darwinism than the mere fact that they stand upon no evidence! It's a problem with language itself; the problem actually is portrayed clearly in the very name of the theory itself "Natural **Selection**"! Let us attempt to understand the language in this term. If by natural you mean it is a selection that occurs in nature, regardless of the power that "selects", what it is and where it is, I may find some space to discuss it with you.

However, Darwin and other atheists who preach his teachings – like the good disciple "Dawkins" here - do not mean that! They precisely mean that **nature** itself "did" or "performed" that selection, blindly and without any will, purpose, plan, or external power! So by "natural" they do not refer to the medium where the process takes place (which is nature), or the belief that it is a phenomenon that is observable in nature (a natural phenomenon); they rather refer to the **agent** that performs, runs, and maintains the process of selection! They call it nature!

Selection in its very meaning is a purposeful act, or deed, one that no healthy human mind can let go of the rational necessity of ascribing it to a "doer" of some sort, one that is willful and purposeful! One who has a rule by which to select! When you say this thing "was selected", there is no rational escape from the linguistic necessity of having an unmentioned actor here (as is the case with every verb in the passive voice in almost all languages of the world)! Something was done; it follows naturally, that it must have a doer, an actor! That doer is responsible for doing this deed (selection) not once or twice, but for keeping it up as a "method" all along those long billions of years that Darwinians assign as a span for natural history! Now, by what reason do they expect us to believe that beyond this amazingly consistent and unbelievably resourceful plan there is no determination of external plan and purpose; one that puts meaning into the very language they cannot avoid using to describe it?

It may be more meaningful to replace (natural) with (blind) or (non-selected). Indeed, in my view, “non-selected” is a term that draws the picture perfectly! I mean by this term to say: Selection did take place, but things were actually “not selected” by anything at all! There was selection, but there was no “selector”! Isn’t this what Darwin believes? Yes it is! (**select-oid species or traits**) may also do the job! After all, if there is no willful purposeful power that made the selection according to an inclusive plan that gives the process its very linguistic meaning, then living things were not actually “selected” but only appear as though they were! Just as it is the case in Dawkins’ coinage (Designoid) here! And if we allowed for things to appear as though they were created, then why shouldn’t we allow for them to appear as though they were “selected”, when in fact there is no “selection” at all?

Well, it is not “natural” selection then; it is more like: “non-selected selection”! An undone deed! Something that is, and is not, both at the same time! To put it in mathematical terms, this is just like saying: **0 = 1**

So, in a nutshell we may argue that just like Christians believe that God is both three, and one at the same time (3 =1)… Darwinians believe that Living beings are both designed, and not designed at the same time (1 = 0)! Nature both did and did not perform or maintain “selection”, at the same time! One can also put it this way; they believe the creator (genes) to have both (designed) and (not designed) natural life, simultaneously! And while all false and corrupted religions build upon such fallacies of reason and language in some of their basic tenets, the Darwinian “religion” commits the worst of them all! Their radical abuse of language and reason should easily place them at the top of the list!

I can easily coin a term (trin-oid) or (three-oid God) to express what Christians believe about the deity; that though it may appear to be three gods, it is actually all but one! Now, why should we view this fallacy to be any more irrational than the Dawkins’ (Designoid objects)? In terms of language and reason - not in terms of the particular meaning in both faiths - it’s virtually the same trick! Actually, I don’t need to coin any (-oid) term! There is indeed a term that does this exact job in Christian theology! It is:

triune! “Triune” means both (three and one; “tri” and “une”) at the same time! (i.e. **3=1**)! What kind of a meaning is this: Something that is both three things and one thing at the same time? A fundamentally false meaning!

It is said that the term Triune was first injected in Christian theology by Tertullian of Carthage (A.D. 160-225) the early church theologian. He did that in an attempt to make room for this corrupt meaning in language! It is an attempt to forge a new word for a meaning that is utterly false and irrational! And here, we have the exact same attempt in the twentieth century; however it is only played by a scientist this time rather than a priest!

So is Dawkins the “Tertullian” of Darwinism? Obviously so!

> *“Sometimes the language of information theory is used: the Darwinian is challenged to explain the source of all the information in living matter, in the technical sense of information content as a measure of improbability or 'surprise value'.” (The God Delusion, p.114)*

I say: yes, they are challenged by that indeed! Matter is controlled and governed by laws that have to be forced upon it, continually, by an external source, and with a lot of information that cannot originate from matter itself, because obviously, X cannot have created X, and set the rules that define the very nature and behavior of X!

Two pebbles on a table should remain just that: Two pebbles on a table, with nothing at all to relate them, other than being “placed” on a table; they are liable to any external effect of any kind! But if you held them in your hand, and placed them in a box; a relation would then be defined; new information is added as a system, one that did not come from them, but from the agent working from outside. A system is now defined for them; the system of being two pebbles in a closed box (instead of two pebbles on a table)! The definition (the information) did not originate from the pebbles but from an intelligent purposeful agent who created the medium and the governing laws of the system: (the box, and the enclosure within it)!

Had there been no external agent to '*do*' anything, or to place any medium or system or laws, could we've ever come to say that there is anything at all that relates those two pebbles to each other? That's the point! "Accident" – according to the atheist definition of chance - does not generate information; not the information that would define a **system** along with all its governing rules!

Two atoms in space will never react *'by chance'*; much less create a system of order that would continue to be self- maintained by a set of laws and rules for "millions" of years, unless there is a previously prepared medium and "plan" for this particular purpose!

We will further iterate on this meaning later on!

Quote:

> *"However statistically improbable the entity you seek to explain by invoking a designer, the designer himself has got to be at least as improbable"*

Again, the same redundant "regress" objection, but in a rather '*scientific'* terminology! First of all, when we speak of a creator we're not "seeking to explain" anything! We're only stating a rational necessity; one that everything in existence proves and demonstrates! As for studying physical causes of certain natural phenomena in a way that helps making use of those phenomena for man's welfare; this is by no means hindered or stalled by the belief in the creator beyond; and the queries posed, and the hypotheses tested by scientists in this regard and for this end, have nothing to do with this belief! So the statement "seek to explain by invoking a designer" is fundamentally irrelevant to the subject matter! This confusion in fact comes from the use of the word "explain" itself, and the nature of the query of research that it expresses. It's another problem with the use of scientific terminology that has to be addressed inclusively.

What "explanation" … ?!

Atheists would so commonly raise the "complaint" that believers in a creator do not "explain" anything, and that they only manage to escape the question by saying: This is the work of God!

The problem here is in the position they take for granted; the blind position that any question they ask, is by necessity:

1 – plausible, reasonable, and legitimate

2 – has to be answered by nothing but observable material causes that are analogous in every way to those we currently know and understand!

This position comes from a materialist philosophy, the foundations of which are far more corrupt than those people think they know!

First of all, whoever said that I **should** accord myself and my answers with a question that I know - and can easily prove – is entirely built on false philosophy and corrupt reason? When you ask me to explain something that is beyond the ability of the human mind to explain or imagine [18], and then you come to blame me for resorting to an answer that invokes an agent at the end of the regress the nature of which cannot be explained as well; this is not a deficiency in my answer; it's in fact a fundamental problem with *your* epistemic conception of the question in hand! If anything, it's not me who's answering too little; it's you who is asking too much!

In the previous chapter we gave many examples of "rationally corrupt" questions, like when a man asks: Can God Kill himself and stay alive? Or Can God create a rock he cannot carry? … etc.! We explained that no reasonable man has to do anything in response to such stupid questions but prove to the one who asks them that they're rationally corrupt and cannot be answered!

This is the point!

[18] Reason necessitates that this act of creation **cannot** be analogized to anything we know or have ever seen!

Your questions are not all by necessity rational, or wise, or at least, valuable to human knowledge! So, let's examine the validity and rationality of the query itself in the light of human capacity, and the powers of his tools of observation and research, not to mention in the light of wisdom and ethics; before we speak of whether or not this "explanation" or that is satisfactory and reasonable as an answer to the question of origins!

I am not EXPLAINING anything when I say that the creator did it; I'm only saying that though I may not be capable of answering this question in detail, I do know that it is by necessity part of the works of the creator, who is by necessity, external and cannot be analogized to any part of the system that He created!

The belief that there is nothing that man cannot do, or his mind cannot grasp, is absolutely false, and is easily proven false by the mere examination of the way the human mind itself works, and of the history of human knowledge itself! The mere variance among human minds from "dead stupid" to "genius" proves it! The very fact that we cannot solve two problems (simultaneously) or think about two issues at the same time, proves it! The fact that we do forget, err, get surprised, change our minds, regret, fear, and so forth; proves it!

So what kind of an "explanation" is he talking about, and of what exactly? Of the origins of natural life? What's the purpose of such a query? Is he, the atheist, seeking to possess the ability to perhaps create another universe, or to create natural life from dead matter in a lab? Nope! This is not the real urge (although it is there in the hearts of some of them)! I say this, speaking of what they call science not what they call "science fiction"; even though in their blindly ambitious delusion they can hardly make any distinction between what is rationally possible and what is not!

By seeking "explanation", an atheist is simply trying to satisfy a humanly inevitable need to **know** where he came from and where he is going! This is the true urge and motive. But what does this have to do with **how** natural life emerged on Earth? Whoever said that we the humans can or even need to know **how** natural life emerged on Earth? We rather need to know **who**, or

what caused it to be, and essentially: **WHY**! This is the question that is really definitive of who we are, what we are here for, and whatever awaits us after death! And it is clear that we cannot make up an answer to that! We have to obtain it from the only source it is to be obtained from; the evidently authentic teachings of the creator Himself!

So not only do they lack the ability to answer the questions they're asking and taking false routes to acquire an answer to; **they don't even know the right question to ask for that end,** to begin with!

Origination of life is obviously a process that must have involved a transformation that is external to our limited human ability to imagine! The first transformation from a bunch of dead inanimate atoms, into a fully functional initial living being (it has to start fully functional or else it will not survive as a living thing to begin with!), is by necessity un-analogous to anything we have ever seen! We have only seen species breeding from one another! We have only seen elements of the system interacting! So whatever does this interaction and the way it takes place, have to do with the process that caused the system itself to originate! That process is clearly and rationally unlike any process of creation or transformation we can mentally grasp or imagine!

If the very core of the way science and statistical reasoning works (as a device for obtaining knowledge), is analogy and abstract classification of observable phenomena, then the limits of this device should easily be recognized and observed! If something cannot – by its very ontological definition - be analogized to anything we can possibly observe; then it is only reasonable that it **cannot be explained** by applying this device of obtaining knowledge! So what "explanation" are they asking for?

It's the same problem with the so called "big bang" theory! It is a shot at an unachievable aim! We can never prove or even imagine the very first event that brought about matter from nothingness, or that brought about this universe as we see it, from another form of matter the likes of which we have never seen! Why do they so arrogantly insist on putting the process in the cast of something that can be analogized to currently observable and

testable phenomena of nature or physics? How can any reasonable man think of the origin of matter itself, to have undergone a process that submits to the very laws that govern the way that matter reacts with itself within this system as it is?

How can I suppose that a car – for example – was created, by means of a method that is analogous to the ways its engine starts, or its wheels run or its doors open? If I were an AI software running inside a computer device, how can I suppose that the computer itself was manufactured not in a factory but in the memory of a bigger computer, as the output of some computer software? This is nonsense! **The way a certain system runs, is not the way it was created, and the rules that were set by its creator to control it, do not apply to that creator Himself!** You cannot explain the origin of a system by proposing a process that is only part of the way the system itself is made to work! Reason denies this! Nevertheless; this is the kind of "explanation" they so arrogantly seek to "obtain", and charge believers in the creator with "escaping" the "scientific method" in obtaining it! The scientific method doesn't even begin to work in that area! You either come up with some pathetic analogy between a currently observable phenomenon of nature, and the way nature itself came to be, making that an "explanation" for the origins of the universe (Abiogenesis: analogy to a bang – Evolution: analogy to certain observable biological processes), or you have nothing at all, and whatever you say is not plausible and not satisfactory!

My argument here goes far deeper than the "cat and mouse" game that Christian "creationists" play with "evolutionists"! It's a question of the purpose of knowledge examining the very objective of this form of science itself! I'm not examining the "answer" or "the explanation" here, I'm questioning the philosophical validity of the fundamental question itself, as a query of science, and the ways atheists believe should lead to answering it! Do not ask me to give you the 'scientific' answer to a question that is in itself rationally unanswerable or fruitless, or cannot be answered by the tools of science (like the question: How did life originate on Earth), and when I say I can only take knowledge about the origin of life from scripture and ask

for no more than I find there; you go charging religion with intolerance to "science"!

Many atheists would automatically respond to any phenomenon that may not at first glance appear to match any known explanation to them, by the attitude of saying: "It must have some rational explanation". Now, we do not object to the meaning of this statement. Yes of course everything must have a "rational explanation", regardless of whether or not we can obtain it in the present time. But what exactly is it that they mean by "rational"? You'd imagine that as scientists, they are open to all possibilities as long as they could be proven by scholarly plausible evidence, be it empirical, historical, or logical (/mathematical)! After all, this is what they claim science is all about, right?! Well, actually they're not!

By rational and "scientific", they only mean causes and phenomena that can be observed or tested empirically, according to their current notion of what natural causes are! Even though they do admit that much of what may today qualify as "supernatural" will tomorrow be "natural", they would so easily dismiss any claims of a metaphysical agent, whatever that agent may be, as though there is no way of proving the validity of a certain claim other than direct observation and empirical testing (the scientific method)! They would listen to you, only if your model of an answer sounds "falsifiable" according to Popper's principle! Only if it is in the form of something they can perceive, sense and examine empirically!

But is this, (direct observation), the only route to proving the validity of a certain argument or a certain claim? Absolutely not! Direct observation is only one form of evidence! There is also evidence from rational deduction and induction, and there is evidence from reliable historical narration! In fact, the two routes (the rational and the observational) to establishing evidence, are so intertwined in the process of science that one cannot – by any rational means – separate them!

How many men in history had an apple drop on their heads whilst resting under a tree? Hundreds, perhaps even thousands! But only when Newton thought it over and contemplated, a certain rational conclusion struck him;

one that turned this apple into **evidence**! It became evidence for a “physical force” that was then called “gravity”, and is now a granted fact of nature! Could Newton at the time “observe” gravity? Could anybody observe gravity or perhaps bottle it in some container? No! So what was Newton’s method of proving the existence of a force that affected the apple and pulled it to the ground? It was a rational method! It was a form of rational evidence! This is how Newton ***proved*** the existence of “Gravity”! This rational evidence became basis for countless empirical experiments, deductions and accumulation of scientific evidence!

It has always been very clear that there is a universal power of some kind that pulls everything to the ground! This was not Newton’s “discovery”! It wasn’t anybody’s discovery! However, only when somebody with the quantifying mentality of a mathematician, eventually expressed that force in a physical quantity, did it come to be called “Scientific” and “physical”! One would so enthusiastically jump now and explain the universal pull of Earth – and other planets and stars - to everything on its surface as gravity, and say this is the “scientific explanation”!

Now we didn’t see atheists reject this conclusion by Newton on the grounds that it raised the immediate question of “what is gravity and where does it come from?”! Does this “explanation” tell us anything about the exact nature of this “force” or its actual source? Does it tell us what it’s made of, or how it really affects things the way it does? No! It is only a name for a physical quantity; a scientific terminology, dubbed as a physical quantity for calculating the magnitude, speed, acceleration, Work, energy, and other observable “effects” of that force that we have always known existed! We have never observed the real nature of that force itself, so our proof of it remains to be no more than a rational proof, and our explanation remains to be nothing but a pragmatic expression of how it affects our lives! From its many quantifiable effects, we can tell it is there; it has to be there!

Now the question is; why do atheists deny an equally – actually far more - rational process that we apply when we say for example that there is by necessity a creator responsible for the existence of the universe and everything inside it? Why do they refuse to call **that** an “explanation”? We

have never seen that creator, neither have they ever seen gravity! We have only seen His observable deeds, just as we have only seen observable effects of gravity! And we can rationally prove that He must be beyond human analogy, and so we cannot seek to learn anything about Him through the methods of science! Now do we have to claim the creator to be a "physical" force working within the bounds of nature, and turn Him into a mathematical quantity, or speak of Him as though He may one day be tested and observed, so that they would view this reasoning as a *satisfactory* explanation?

Well, you cannot upset their dream of observing everything that can possibly exist, and testing it in a lab! You cannot dare upset their dreams of becoming gods in this universe, and obtaining complete knowledge of everything that could possibly be known! This is why they are so persistent on making the driving force responsible for running natural life; only a bunch of molecules in the nuclei of living cells; namely, DNA! As irrational as it really is, this is the only form of "explanation" they would approve of! This is the only kind of claim that they would call "science"! Why? Because they just "hate" to admit that the creator is out of reach of their test tubes, and will never be submitted to their labs, and will never fall under their dominion! They would contradict one of the basic foundations of human knowledge: (i.e. Deduction through rational evidence), only because they couldn't possibly imagine that someday all those tons of PHDs and books written on evolution and Darwinism might be ridiculed and thrown in the trashcan of history!

Yes indeed this is where the problem really is! There are a huge number of influential atheists in scientific academia in the west today, according to whose beliefs and philosophies the meaning of what "Science" is and what "a rational explanation" should be like, is defined! Anybody who wishes to be anything among those people, should offer them only what they would approve of and accept as "scientific"! Anybody who dares challenge the foundations of their philosophies, the fundamental objectives and goals of their lifetime works and publications, is simply doing something that is pretty much like telling any follower of any religion: Your Faith is false; all the way down to the core! This is why whatever that offender may say, and whatever form of evidence he may offer, he will always be ridiculed and so

easily dubbed "pseudoscience"! A guaranteed "career killer" for any academic researcher in natural sciences in the west, mind you!

When an archaeologist comes up with the discovery of some "mega-fauna" fossil for example, or an "out of place" artifact, or the so called "Ancient technology and anomalous findings" or a "giant skeleton of a man", or so forth, he is so easily dismissed as delusional, forger, or "conspiracy theorist" at best! Now I could not care less whether such findings are indeed true or just fabrications! Fossils are actually evidence for nothing at all dealing with the question in hand! But in the light of the currently well known reputation of evolutionists and their fabrication of many fossils of "hominids" from pig teeth and ape remains, one would not dismiss the possibility of any "crime" against human knowledge and scientific honesty from the fathers of the "Church" of evolution!

In fact, one can hardly imagine that a young enthusiastic archaeologist or paleontologist would choose to ridicule himself and destroy his career in scientific academia by claiming to have found a finding that will have him labeled "pseudo-scientist"! Of course, it is possible that he may think of becoming a "creationist hero" of some sort, for those poor Christian biologists who actually think that fossils may help their cause! But the point is, no matter what anybody may find, it is only called "science" if it fits somewhere within the academic mainstream; the current 'religion' of academia! People do want to get their degrees granted, and "evolve" in their academic careers! This is why "Scientific academia" in the west (especially in Europe) has indeed become a purely atheistic cult, in every sense of the word! It is the shield beyond which that corrupt religious doctrine hides itself today, and preaches its beliefs as "rational" and "scientific"!

This, my respectable reader, is the "Faith" that those people have inherited, lived by and defended – and continue to do so - just as blindly as any follower of any false faith… It is the philosophy according to which they decide what qualifies as "science" or "explanation" and what doesn't!

In our experience with answering misconceptions about Islam, we have seen clearly that it is really not because of a misunderstanding of a particular text

or a certain ruling that they charge their attacks! It is basically – as I explain thoroughly in volume 2 - because they make judgments on those teachings based on a fundamentally flawed foundation of moral philosophy, hence a corrupt understanding of the problem that this ruling addresses! They look at Islam through thick glasses of false philosophy and corrupt cultural tradition! So easily would they say, for example, this teaching violates "human rights"! Thus, it is a false corrupt teaching! End of story! When we answer to such a delusion as the reader will see, we have to first address what it is exactly that they view as rightful to all men, and according to what wisdom and evidence they defined them as "rights" in the first place, and what exactly it is that they know about this particular thing they claim that Islam deprives "man" from his "right" to do! And at that, we start proving to this denigrator that indeed it is his knowledge that he was brought up on in his society as a cultural norm, and according to which he makes his judgment; that is questionable and evidently corrupt!

This is why in Islam when we respond to misconceptions we do not call those answers "apologetics" (and I seriously lament any translator who may do so!)! Islam is not making "apology" or "defense"! It addresses the way its offenders view life itself; proving to them how wrong a great deal of their commonly accepted norms are, showing them that this is indeed the reason why they may see healthy as sick, wealthy as poor, rational as irrational, right as wrong, beautiful as ugly; and eventually: created as 'designoid'!

Just look at this statement here:

> *"A deep understanding of Darwinism teaches us to be wary of the easy assumption that design is the only alternative to chance, and teaches us to seek out graded ramps of slowly increasing complexity." (Dawkins, p. 114)*

Well, first of all, by what standard of rational examination of the questions in hand, do we view "easy" in this context to mean "irrational", "shallow", "poor" or "unscientific"? Yes it is easy, very easy indeed to say that the creator is the first cause for everything that we observe around us, including our very own selves! But does this make it irrational or untrue? Does this

make such an argument false? Since when was the simple and clearly easy argument an unwelcome argument only because it's "easy"?

Atheists must understand that when we speak of those questions, we are not "seeking alternatives" to "Chance"! Chance is not in the picture at all to begin with! It cannot be there! Chance – according to the meaning that there is no willful purposeful designer - is the exact opposite of **order**! It cannot *generate* system; neither can system be ruled or governed by a law that comes from it! Chance – as we elaborated earlier - is the meaning we use to express something that is humanly unexpected or external to the way ***we*** would plan things or envision them to be!

When a man throws dice, the numbers that will come out are – to him – random – because quite simply he cannot think of any particular rule by which he could achieve a determinate result or make a prediction of a particular outcome at any level of certainty before he throws them! He doesn't know why they gave out those particular values in this particular throw! However, if one day - for the sake of the argument - all physical factors that affect the way the die falls and rolls on the table, where calculated carefully, including the physics of the way a specially designed machine – mimicking the human hand - throws it, all in full detail, then the numbers coming out will **not** be called random any more, will they? Once you find out the rule; it's not random anymore; or at least we could say that the (sample space) of all probable results of a particular throw will be shrunk effectively!

You study the pattern, emerging from a set of causes plenty of which are no longer unknown to you; hence you can make a prediction that is far more likely to be correct! You will then know how to use certain methods to obtain particular results with relative certainty that you once thought unachievable!

The point is: Once you know it; it's not "random" anymore!

Chance & Random = You **do not know** yet!

Now when they claim that favorable mutations emerge at random, they are applying the meaning of randomness – which is no more than a description of a certain status of relative human knowledge – to the very system the perfectness and orderliness of which defines the very meaning of natural law and order in our human notion!

How do we know time? Had it not been for the perfectly steady motion in the solar system, could we've ever known time? How do we tell our directions and orientations without the steadiness of star locations in the sky above, and the constant order of magnetic polarity that defines the very way a compass works? How do we know reality? Had it not been for the fact that every time we open our eyes, as we look facing a certain direction we see a logical sequence of progression of events, could we have perceived any meaning for reality? How could we construct our buildings applying mathematics of structure analysis without the ultimate steadiness of the law of gravitation and the constant laws of molecular bonding in building materials? What civilization could we ever create in these modern times, if it were not for the steadiness and perfectness of the natural order of electromagnetism and thermodynamics? How do we know any system of our making is working properly without examining it under orderly laws of this perfect system of nature? How do we "know" any order at all, had it not been for the perfectness of this system itself that we apply for knowing and comprehending?

It is this very system (nature and everything in it, animate and inanimate) the system that gives the word order in our language its very meaning; that they are so blindly trying to plague with their defiance and ignorance, and inject "randomness" somewhere in its midst!

This clearly destroys the very meaning of natural law itself! There has always been a limited man, reasoning through relative analogies (under limits of the nature of his knowledge and perception), trying to discover the wonders of this perfect order around him, as he proceeds reasoning those features of perfect order around him as rigid "laws" that are constant and perfectly stable! Whenever this limited man falls short of discovering the governing rule beyond a particular phenomenon, he calls it "chance" only to

express his current incapability, and to propose perhaps a different method of making use of that phenomenon (like probability statistics, or chaos mathematics)! Imperfectness is only in the way by which he sees natural phenomena and attempts to comprehend and model them, not in nature itself! Today he knows little, tomorrow he knows more; it is his knowledge that increases by accumulation, not the orderliness of an already perfect system!

However, this is the philosophy upon which atheism builds its science! Self-contradictory language, blind conception of "explanation" and false application of statistical reasoning!

"Make no mistake now, the very thing that defines order in your life, is not in fact as orderly as you think it may be! It's only "Orderoid"! There's randomness underneath every aspect of it; you just need to read a little more Darwinian literature, and you'll be there before you know it!"

What the author fails to understand – or rather refuses to admit - is that even this very claim that he holds that complexity increased gradually and slowly, is itself in full and sheer contradiction with his understanding as much as with any possible linguistic interpretation of the word "chance"! This is because quite simply, without a previous determinate plan for complexity to *increase*, and without a specially prepared and preserved medium for that very purpose, and for the process to maintain and proceed as stable as such along those billions of years they speak of (even along a few generations for that matter), no "increase in complexity" could ever take place!

Every single achievement of natural sciences, every single natural law any man has ever discovered or applied in technology and engineering for his welfare, everything around him screams in his face with the word **creation**, and yet he so blindly tries to push "randomness" into parts of it, only because he cannot understand those parts! And he calls that an "explanation"!

Now let's take a closer look at this "slowly increasing complexity" in the Darwinian notion!

In the third lecture of the series ‘Growing up in the universe’, Dawkins uses a wooden model to explain how the “eye”, according to him, has evolved gradually! Interesting enough, he starts by stating that the first “form” of an eye that ever came about by random mutation, must have been no more than a simple sheet that can only tell light from dark! One then has to wonder, what use is this “eye” really? If he claims it may work in detecting a prey; then this “eye” certainly can’t help with that! If he claims it may do anything in detecting a predator, then obviously a creature that can only see light and dark, will never identify a predator from a prey from anything at all, and by the time the shadow of a predator is detected by that poor pathetic “eye”, it will obviously be too late to do anything about it!

They claim that the fact that we can still see such an eye in certain species in nature today is evidence to support their story of the evolution of the eye! This is sheer nonsense because obviously this species has always been equipped with everything it needs for survival and it needs no more of an eye than this! But can we – humans – for example, survive as a species for a single generation in the wilderness with such an eye? Every single form of “the eye” - or let’s better say “the optic organ” - that we observe today in nature exists in perfect accord with the exact function it is supposed to be doing, in perfect accord with its particular place in nature, not a single bit less or more! We’ve never seen a single life form become extinct (or endangered) because its “eyes” are not sufficient, have we? The perfect equilibrium of all those living species is evidence enough! Now isn’t it a pity how some people would strive to argue the exact inverse of what every healthy mind can only make out of this perfect balance in this vast variety of perfectly configured life forms on Earth?

Do not believe your eyes folks! You’re only tempted to see “design” in “designoid” objects! You are all fooled! Time to raise your consciousness!

As I argued in an earlier section: in any given moment in time, if the acquisition of a certain organ or genetic trait is a survival necessity, then any offspring that comes out lacking it will hardly ever reproduce, not to mention deliver a number of generations that could last long enough for a

favorable mutation to come along by pure chance, and save whatever remains of that poor "species"!

It is amazing how they fail to realize the rational necessity of there being some determinate pattern that must have always been there to guide the claimed process of evolution, to – at least - guarantee that every time the natural conditions of life in a certain locale (not to mention on a global scale) would change, the desired corresponding genetic change would appear in due time, before the entire system collapses!

Look at the theories they propose for the cause of extinction of the Dinosaur! None of them – if you look deep enough – should allow in any way for natural life to continue on Earth, without the necessity of there being a collective system of balance that shifts and adjusts many parameters of natural life on earth for that particular end: not only the continuity of natural life but even its ongoing 'evolution'!

Genes are – like all other parts of the collective system of nature - blind inanimate molecules that have no awareness of nature, of local ecosystems, of food chains, or even of the very species the properties of which they are made to preserve (they do not "select" anything)! So obviously this necessary code of control cannot come from anything within natural life! All systems of nature, animate and inanimate, are governed by stable laws, and must point – because of the perfect order that binds the entire system together - to a single controller that runs them all simultaneously and harmoniously from outside (the end point of a similar regress to the regress of causes)!

Yet, evolutionists insist on looking at living beings and the way they emerged and survived on Earth, in separate from other systems of order that constitute nature as a whole, and they seek to attribute a collectively balanced system of order to a long line of random events that took place among certain molecules that could not by any means have caused a system to emerge, much less have anything to do with maintaining it! A part of the system is no more than a part of the system, one that is controlled – like all other parts - from outside by the very being from whence comes the

definition of the system itself! Darwinism so blindly seeks to *dissolve* that perfect order and to arbitrarily inject randomness and chance into its delicate joints, only for the sole end of denying the creator! This is the only kind of "explanation" that they would call science! Either it starts off from pathetically blind and empty beginnings, and advances gradually, like a blind human may do with something of his own making in some lab or factory; or it is too "improbable" for them to even consider!

That's why I find it quite fair to say that Darwinism in reality doesn't remove the creator from the process; the human mind cannot afford to do that; instead, it turns His role in nature into a mere initiator (a random generator) of a long futile journey of blind try and error (namely: Natural selection), or what Dawkins calls "the blind watchmaker"! Praised be His almighty names! No matter how hard they try they will never deny the undeniable! They will never escape a necessary creator!

It is necessary that there be some governing law that would adjust genetic and demographic changes of different species to all natural conditions on Earth, all so that the system survives and flourishes as such, no matter what. How are we supposed to believe that in billions of years of age, every time any change of climatic or natural conditions on Earth in general took place, Darwinian "mechanisms" were always sufficient to keep the process running, and even rising gradually all along the way? How many random major events, in natural life or in nature itself may have easily emerged that would be enough to devastate that unplanned unguided 'progress' altogether, and destroy natural life entirely, and what effect would a longer span of time have on this "probability"?

It is absolutely amazing that they would still speak of the creator as "improbable"!

It is in fact - applying their notion of "probability" for the sake of the argument – a billion gazillion times more improbable that natural life may have ended up today in this perfectness that we see and live, after such an extremely long *journey* through the unknown, unplanned, unguided, and basically random progression, than after a single masterful event of

purposeful creation! Please revise my discussion of the Boeing 747 example in the first section of this Chapter, and then answer this question: How *likely* is it that in billions of years of time, not for once did it ever happen that any random event of nature – cosmic, seismic, climatic, nuclear, magnetic, meteoritic, geologic or whatever - was sufficient in magnitude to blow the whole thing off altogether? How likely is it that for billions of years not a single cosmic event that could cause even the slightest shift in any of the values of physical constants beyond the range that allows for life to progress and continue on Earth (thus causing all natural life to fail) ever occurred?

Every time any event at any scale happened anywhere, life always '*found'* a way; it survived and continued amazingly nonetheless, not only so, but even continued to "evolve" globally (according to Darwinism)! Never did it happen that the long awaited "favorable random mutation" that would enable every species to continue its survival "purpose" in accordance with natural changes (at least climatic), failed to emerge "randomly" before the point where the entire system crashes down! And in billions of years, such has always been the case! All this, and they believe "creation" is highly improbable!

It's interesting how Dawkins in his lectures emphasizes on the meaning that we are extremely lucky to be here, far more so than we can imagine! Little does he realize that in doing so, he is actually rendering the Darwinian story far more "improbable" – by his own terminology - than the story of creation!

What lesson have we learnt from nature, if not perfectness of balance and overall equilibrium? Did this balance also come about by chance, out of natural selection? This is impossible! The system cannot start without that balance already conditioned for it! Construction of new subsystems balances the decay of old ones; action balances reaction, positive balances negative, the intake of new molecules from the ecosystem balances the release of old molecules into it, death rates – for whatever cause death may be – balance the birth rates, and so on! It's a universal constant in all nature, one that keeps natural life from failure! Had there ever been an insufficient amount of Oxygen or Hydrogen – for example - in the atmosphere, at any point in the history of natural life, all life would've failed! What could possibly

guarantee – in a universe that has no sustainer or keeper - that this collective universal balance doesn't dwindle throughout those billions of years? No matter what changes, cosmic events, or catastrophes may take place at any given moment, the universal balance is always maintained in favor of natural life! In their sickening close-mindedness, Darwinians look at natural life as though it has always been evolving in a test tube, or inside a lab; they cannot realize – or they deliberately neglect - the way the entire universe has to be kept all along history in its favor!

Nowhere in the system could there possibly be any room for "chance" – as opposed to determinate order!

If – again - they wish to speak in terms of probability then let me ask them this: How probable is it, that the system of natural life would remain stable – stable enough not to fail and perish – all along those millions of years, under effect of all hazards, sudden and gradual (unfavorable) changes in the environment, and devastating natural catastrophes of all sorts, with a survival program that is based entirely on the survival and pervasion of favorable mutations that come about by nothing but pure chance (assuming that mutations could ever ADD new organs!)? How likely is it that there would always be a collectively successful process of natural selection that keeps the system intact all the way through, no matter what, when there is no external guiding factors of any sort? And if it ever did happen that the whole thing came apart and life actually perished entirely on earth (which should be quite likely), then how likely is it that it would start all over again, starting from that miserable pool of floating proteins?

So obviously, excessively long spans of time are not helping them with their claim of higher probability for evolution by natural selection the way they think it does! If anything at all, it only makes this mythical scenario of theirs far more "unlikely" and "improbable"! Millions of times more "improbable" than the sudden leap that Dawkins proposed the parable of "mount probable" only in attempt to avoid!

After all, to speak their own language, a single successful act of creation is far more likely (probable) to have started off this perfect system, than

a series of millions of perfectly favorable and collectively orchestrated and naturally balanced and synchronized events of chance, that are – according to them – neither controlled, nor guided by anything but the "success" of those who manage to reproduce… !

How "probable" is it that natural life would always – in a collective global scale – keep proceeding up the metaphorical mountain, with no rule at all to guarantee any orderly control of the essential balance between natural life as a whole and the surrounding environment?

To further elaborate the falsity of their rationale of improbability even in the way they apply it, in a world that is free from any previous plan or deliberate conditioning for the sake of natural life (i.e. it just so happened by pure chance that the universe was perfectly prepared for it), it is said that it's probable that favorable chance events come along and add to the score of natural life, gradually. Thus I wonder: is it not supposed to be far more probable and commonplace that destructive and devastative chance events would come along to wipe out all natural life and disrupt any accumulation that may have taken place of anything at all? Isn't this what we should expect from analogy to other celestial bodies roaming everywhere around us in the outer space? I mean there's obviously an infinite number of possible events the least of which not only could exterminate life on Earth, but also leave it without any chance for reappearance! So when they hold that with more time, the probability of more positive chance events would rise, I say that on the other hand, the probability of more negative chance events to take place should also rise, orders of magnitude higher, considering the number of variables included in the process. Thus, as previously argued, it is infinitely improbable that natural life would start to emerge on Earth, and start its evolution, and after some cosmic event wipes it all out, it starts over again! By what sense could they possibly estimate the story of a single act of creation - or any story at all for that matter - to be more improbable than this?

The balance is clearly so sensitive that everything has to be accounted for, in perfect precision! So by what reason are we supposed to accept the injection of "random events" at any point there?

Here's another challenge to Darwinians: How do you explain the evolution of the so called "Food chain"? It is clear that for a species to be herbivorous is far less dangerous, less tiresome, less energy consuming and much easier in acquiring the prey than being a carnivore! There's an economic argument to be made here! Chasing a running prey is obviously much more difficult and energy consuming than feeding from a tree or from grass, and animals all tend – by nature - to reduce their efforts and spend more time in their territories and with their mates! In fact it could be argued that this would give them higher chances of reproducing (which is what natural selection favors)! So why didn't natural selection make all species into herbivores?

And without an initially balanced proportion between birth rates and death rates due to the relation between predator and prey, how could any food chain emerge at all, from a previous state where there is none? And if all this doesn't mean the necessity of previous initial conditioning and stabilization, then what does it mean?

One of the examples Dawkins used in one of his lectures was the key lock. He said that if nature is the lock, then the species doesn't always have to be the key, the perfect key, in order to open it! It may do for some time as half a key! Now I cannot imagine how he could possibly grant such an example any degree of reasonability! He couldn't possibly do better, shooting himself in the foot! The lock is either open, or it is closed! Half open is no good for anything, because quite simply, it is **not** open! Same goes for half closed! A lock either blocks entry – which is what it's made for – or it doesn't! There's no such a thing as a half lock! Equally, a half key is good for nothing! If its job is to open the lock, and it's not doing it, then it's not **the key** for this lock! Period!

The purpose of the key is not at all to be achieved by anything but the right key! Same goes for the exact purpose of an eye! Seeing only light and dark is not at all the purpose of the eye as we use it! I really can't imagine how Dawkins would bring along the example of the key and the lock to triumph for Darwinism! What was he thinking?

Where does any criterion of evaluation come from, according to which natural selection "selects" only what is best and what keeps the system balanced at every single twist or turn, without ever running a risk of having the entire system collapse? Without an agent that is perfectly aware of the implications of breeding this and breeding that, of the essential balance – that has to be kept stable all along - between birth rates and death rates in every species, as part of the entire equilibrium of natural life and food chains, balancing species with each other, and with the resources of nature, water cycles, plantation cycles, environmental conditions and so forth, how is it even remotely possible for such a system to proceed from one lesser state to a more evolved one, not to mention this evolution be the outcome of a long chain of "chance events"?

If it was all a question of random mutations, then they clearly overlook the fact that mutations as we know them, emerge within an already established species; species that did survive long enough to become a species in the first place! I will leave aside for now the fact that never have we witnessed any mutation that "adds" up new data to the DNA of an animal; only loss and damage! Even if we presumed the possibility of a positive mutation, an animal that is born lacking in terms of survival equipment will never live long enough to breed and speciate to begin with, much less have a chance to "evolve" by means of such a mutation! After all, only the right key will open the lock!

If at a certain point in time, survival without an eye was not possible for a certain species that did not have one, then there's no way it could *evolve* into having one! If without an eye this animal cannot survive, then forget about mutations; there will be no chance for it to even breed to begin with! It will not even be capable of identifying its mate!

A key either works or it doesn't! Yes it may be broken or unrefined, and it may not be working properly because of that! However it is not a key – by definition and by manufacture – if it cannot open the lock! If it does, then there is no "fitter" key to acquire for the particular purpose of opening the lock! It simply fits! There'd be no reason for natural selection not to "select"

it! So it should not perish, neither should it "evolve" for survival (because it already works as it is)!

If however the lock is changed, then the key has to change correspondingly! Otherwise, it will not fit; it will not work! It has to do that in proper synchronization, because at any given moment of time, if not enough members of the species do fit, then it will perish. This means that with gradual change in the lock, a corresponding gradual change in the key has to take place! This gradation can never happen through *random* mutations! Random is contrary to pattern, and gradation is a steady pattern; one that is posed by the necessity of continuous equilibrium!

According to the model of natural selection, animals in changing locale conditions (the lock) should start perishing out, as the gap of adaptability between the genetic makeup of the species and the locale where it lives increases, until all by pure chance, a lucky mutation comes along in a lucky individual, and helps it fit!

Now let it be stated clearly that I'm not denying any observable phenomenon of genetic drift or change that we can currently observe, in micro-biology or anywhere else! I'm only stating the overwhelmingly obvious: that those are purposeful changes (for adaptation and other purposes) that are governed by strict external laws that have no room whatsoever for "chance"! Every specimen or species that perishes is meant to perish for the sake of – among other purposes – keeping the collective balance and by effect of that very same law; not chance! So there couldn't – by any proper stance of reason – be any evidence in genetic adaptation (for example) for the silly scenario of Darwinian evolution!

Evolution means the random emergence of a trait that would turn a species from unfit (failing) to fit (working). **Adaptation on the other hand means the genetic changes in a given species from X to Y, to cope with the changes in natural conditions from A to B, in such that while X was only fit with A, Y is only fit with B**. Since it is clear that genes have no awareness of the changes in natural conditions; then this process obviously necessitates an external law to which genes are made to respond, kept by a

knowledgeable source that runs those synchronous changes within the frame of time that would give the very meaning of adaptation. Without the informed control of timing it is not to be called adaptation! Because if the change happened earlier in the species than the ecological event that should cause it, then it is not its cause, and at that point, the species would move from X to Y still under conditions A, which may render it unfit! So that's not adaptation! [19] And on the other hand if the change from X to Y came to pass more than two generations later than the change from A to B, then it's too late because such as it is, X is not fit to B (which is the reason why adaptation is necessary), so it will become extinct! End of story! Thus we can see that every time we observe that an adaptive change has taken place, we have to admit the necessity of the synchronization of genetic change; which is the meaning that clearly leaves no room for chance whatsoever!

Now applying the Darwinian conception of probability I can argue that if indeed adaptation only took place by chance (random mutations), then it is supposed to be far more improbable to take place in time than otherwise! But that's clearly not what we observe in natural life! Adaptation is a tracking process that happens in nature in almost all living species, so frequently and so perfectly that there can be no doubt in the perfect synchronization of which I speak! How often, on the other hand, do we see a species become extinct due to failure in performing the change before it's too late?

So clearly the claim that chance is involved somehow in this intricate process is sheer blindness!

Adaptive genetic changes to a certain species have to be governed by a stable rule that goes in perfect accordance with changes in the natural locale and in all chains of which this particular species is a part! It cannot be escaped! So what's the meaning, really, of fighting the windmills in such a pathetic way, all for the sake of placing randomness and chance anywhere within what is clearly the ultimate example of perfectness of order and

[19] This is why the term "pre-adaptation" is a misnomer. Those species that seem to get their genes fitted to condition B when still living in condition A, are by necessity suited to both conditions, otherwise they would perish under effect of condition A before the change to condition B takes place.

balance, unmatched by anything that could qualify as 'system' in human notion?!

It's the inclination of a blind heart that hates to admit the clearest fact of all!

Why is Quantum mechanics so incomprehensible and so stupefying? Because it runs in ways that our minds find impossible? Because there's chaos down there and things that are not supposed to be happening in order for the world around us to be as steady and orderly as we see it? This is nonsense! It is hard to understand and grasp because it comes at a level of causes that we humans do not yet have the sufficient power of grasping, tracing or predicting, not because there's chaos or things that are rationally impossible happening down there! We do not yet know how things run at that level, but this doesn't mean that impossible things happen there! **Impossible things never happen anywhere**; that's one of the alphabets of our human reason, and if we're going to get it compromised, then we'd better forget about Quantum physics, mathematics, and science altogether!

The way we currently observe the Quantum world proves – if anything at all – that whatever we may currently view to be chaotic or unpredictable, or does not follow the rules of our logic; is by necessity of reason **uniform and steady all the same**, and is by necessity of reason not without binding laws that have no room for chance or chaos, quite simply because the way things run 'down there', determines the way we see the world around us 'up here', as it is! This is not another world! This is by definition a *subsystem* in this very system that we observe and live in! So the fact that we are currently incapable of modeling it or dealing with it in any way other than probability; is only a sign for our human limitedness, not the existence of nonsensical elements of randomness and chance underneath this perfectly consistent world that we observe! Have you people learnt nothing at all from your long history with scientific knowledge? No tower could possibly stand on footings made of sponge and toilet paper!

This is the Darwinian case with already existing species that "evolve"!

But what about the point when there were no "species" at all of any kind, except for a bunch of proteins and amino-acids, hanging loose in some lake

(the primordial soup)? Is this not the actual point of "origins" that Darwinians seek to answer and prove that the existence of a creator is not necessary for the origination of natural life? I ask, in a pool of aimless molecules, proteins and dead matter, whatever could force those molecules into reacting to become a living thing? Where did the factor that we call "life" itself come from in the equation? I would imagine them reacting – supposing the necessary conditions and binding forces came about by chance – to result in yet another inanimate compound of some sort! But what about "life"! What is it and where does it come from? How did it come to be?

The point I'm simply making here is that: The problem of how exactly life emerged on Earth is **not our problem to solve**! We cannot figure it out, and we clearly do not need to! It's the purposeful creation of a supreme creator, in an act that cannot be analogized to anything we ever saw in this universe, and the only authority of knowledge that could be accepted on what exactly happened there is the revelation of that creator Himself!

End of story!

The very objective or purpose of this "science" is false! Look at Miller when he attempted at creating life from primary proteins in his lab, attempting what the poor man thought would be a simulation of the way life came to be on Earth! Had this man embraced heavenly wisdom and truth before he did what he did, he would have never designed such a ridiculous experiment for such a blind uninformed purpose! Why? Because he'd then have a solid scholarly argument against such a purpose for research! But he didn't, so what was he thinking really? What was his aim? To perhaps unravel the secret of life and death, and offer eternity to mankind? To obtain the power to bring back the dead and to stop people from dying? Is he so narrow minded that he fails to see what cataclysmic results the mere acquisition of such knowledge to man – supposing for the sake of the argument that this is possible - would yield? Is he so blind that he cannot see how essential for the balance of the universe that life and death remain in perfect collective equilibrium the way it is and how that immortality is clearly not a state of being that could be introduced to any part of this system within which we

live? Is he so blind to see the consequences of such a childish approach to science?

Yes, unfortunately he was!

Any man who believes human knowledge cannot be limited, and that mankind will one day obtain "infinite" knowledge, is a blind man! He knows it is limited, he knows it has to be so by pure and simple reason, but he refuses to admit it! He just hates the idea! It is the blindness of arrogance and sickness of the heart! Now am I, by holding such a position, stagnating or sterilizing the "glory" of science? Am I killing the flame or the passion that drives it? When I admit my limits, my very rational limits as a man, hence placing marks on the road of science that tell us which way is the right way to go next, and what goals and objectives are the right ones to claim in science, am I killing the passion or the ambition within scientists that drives them to search? Well if this is indeed the case, then it's not my fault that so many scientists have been fueled by wrong ends and ambitions to do what they do, searching for answers in all the wrong places, or seeking answers to questions that are wrong to begin with!

When I design an experiment, I do it for a purpose! I am trying to find an answer to a question! Thus, it is only wise to make sure, before I start pouring funding, resources and time into it, that this purpose in itself is reasonable, rationally achievable and, of course; fruitful and justifiable! We do not obtain the root purpose beneath science from science itself! The claim that for example man descended from hominids, resulted in billions of dollars poured into research labs where scientists aim at proving that an ape may evolve the same form of human rationality! How did this claim come about? The theoretical basis underneath this research: Is it plausible? Is it reasonable enough to take down to the lab and attempt to prove it? What do they expect now? Do they expect that if one day they managed to teach an ape to perhaps recognize a few words of a human language, or imitate some form of a human activity, one way or another, that this would prove that apes may indeed evolve into men, or that they do in fact share ancestral origins with them?

This is the problem! I'm not by any means against designing experiments or asking questions; no sane man could be! I'm simply against the sheer blindness and irrationality in defining a research query that is false at the very theoretical root of it! And as long as atheists refuse to obtain wisdom from the only source it should be obtained, and as long as they insist on denying the undeniable; they will keep spinning blindly in those closed circles forever!

They would continue to live on this wet dream: If being a god is being omnipotent and omniscient, then why not work for the sake of becoming gods? Why not turn mankind into a race of "gods"? A race of elite beings who know everything and can do anything at all?

I cannot think of a more pathetic mind than one that really fails to realize the rational evidence for the sheer stupidity and impossibility of this image they dream of!

The way "life" emerged on Earth has to be unlike anything we have seen or could ever observe! And to try to figure out the way this event took place by studying certain chemical processes that run in living cells or anywhere else: This is sheer blindness!

The very linguistic meaning of the word "evolution" and "evolve" is clear in describing the process as a process of ongoing *change* from initially existing life forms, to new life forms! It only tries to follow **(animate matter → animate matter)** changes… That's all we ever saw of natural life actually! So by what right or reason do they claim the ability to address the point where no life forms existed at all, (which was the case before the initial event that got the whole thing started) by means of this very same process of logical inference? How do they attempt to address an event where the change was **(inanimate matter → the first animate matter**)? Before there was **(animate matter)** to evolve, there couldn't possibly be "*evolution*"! This is ultimately out of reach of Darwin's theory, and any humanly affordable theory for that matter!

An enthusiastic evolutionist would then jump at me saying: "But this question has nothing to do with evolutionism or Darwin's theory in the first place; it's another discipline of natural sciences called Abiogenesis!"!

Well yes that's true! But correct me if I'm wrong; wasn't it Darwin who suggested that life began in a *"warm little pond, with all sorts of ammonia and phosphoric salts, lights, heat, electricity, etc. present, so that a protein compound was chemically formed ready to undergo still more complex changes"?* (Darwin, Francis, ed. 1887. The life and letters of Charles Darwin, including an autobiographical chapter. London: John Murray. Volume 3. p. 18) wasn't it this suggestion that led to the Miller-Urey experiment and Oparin's mythical "Soup", and became the prevailing thought in this field you mention: the Darwinian explanation of how the first living being – the top of the proclaimed evolutionary ladder – came to be? And more essentially, I ask the Darwinian: **Do you not take it for a personal belief, that science could one day simulate the way life emerged on Early Earth?** Do you not find the current mainstream belief of Abiogenesis plausible?

So I don't care under what discipline of "science" this question goes! It is part of an atheist's religion, and it's a pathetic myth all the same! A myth that has to be put in its right place (in the trashcan alongside Mary Shelley's 'Frankenstein'), once and for all!

Imagine a physicist who wakes up one day in the morning, runs fast to his lab and cries: *"Eureka! Why didn't it ever occur to us before? If we could somehow* ***observe or model "nonexistence*** *" in nature, and study its physical properties; then we could definitely have some hope in finding a way in the future to transform matter and energy from nonexistence to existence! Perhaps I'll find a clue to this somewhere in the curvature of space-time! I don't know… It's a long way to go for science of course, but somebody has to take the first steps; and it's going to be me!"*

He's going to waste his lifetime trying to **observe** or **model** what we call "**nonexistence**" as though it were some state of matter like the gaseous state

or something! So I ask my sane reader: What would you think of this poor fellow?

Well that's exactly what I think of those who seek to create 'life' in the lab, or obtain (animate from inanimate)!

I wouldn't be surprised though that some imaginative physicists out there may read this and say "Hey! Why not?"!

This is what atheism does to a healthy human mind!

Thereby I declare in no uncertain terms that a discipline that seeks to study how inanimate matter turns into animate (namely: **how dead matter comes alive**) is by all means an atheistic "cult" of **pseudoscience**! A delusion of science!

Those biochemical reactions that those chemists play with, in their comic attempt to figure out how life came to be, are reactions between chemicals that continue to be there in the bodies of living species directly after they die; the body of a dead animal clearly doesn't lose any of them in death, and it's not because of this that it dies; so it couldn't be more obvious that those chemicals have nothing to do with the actual agent that defines what life is; the departure of which leaves an organism as a mere dead lump of organic matter!

This is why it always remains a black nightmare in the heart of every evolutionist; his realization that this theory he believes in so strongly, works – according to his faith in it - only within the frame of a system that is already started and prepared initially by means of a power that cannot be explained by it! Evolution – by its very meaning - can only take place on species that are **already established as species**, or on living beings that are already **living**, in a – by necessity – already balanced system! But what about a time before which there was nothing but inanimate matter? Is this not the point that we really target when we pose the question of the origins of life?

Abiogenesis, then, is nothing but the attempt to fulfill a Darwinian's dream!

Evolutionists would often say they do not accept the creator for an answer, simply because it is an explanation that in itself “demands a bigger explanation”! They’d say: “the creator Himself must indeed be far more “complex” than the system he is “proposed” to explain!” [20] But what about the Abiogenetic explanation? What kind of an explanation do you aspire of it to offer?

Miller actually **failed to design** an experiment that was supposed to prove to the world that life emerged all **by chance** without any deliberate preparations, medium restrictions, catalysis, or any form of previous design whatsoever! Is this not a fundamental contradiction? He seeks to design something he believes to be un-designed! So what on Earth was he trying to simulate in the lab? He also forgot that he was seeking to simulate the change from **inanimate to animate**, which is obviously a process that has nothing to do with Chemistry!

So what “explanation” are they speaking of, and what “science” is this?! What are they really after? Are they really seeking the truth, wherever it may be (as clear and easy as it really is) and whatever its source may be, and are willing to accept it as long as its evidence is made clear to them? Or is it just the blind submission to a false philosophy of “science”, whose sole end is to deny the undeniable, and challenge the unchallengeable?

In the end, it all goes down again to the ignorant position of philosophy: “I will only believe in a God if it is something I can test in my lab!” A position that is so arrogant and in deep contradiction with some of the most fundamental rules of human reason and of the very way man obtains knowledge!

[20] It is by all means false to describe the creator in terms of complexity or simplicity because He is by necessity unlike any creature in the universe! Complexity is how He created things: they are composed of complex parts or elements, each of which is composed of parts, and so on; this is how we study His creation, it is only the human way of examining it, and He is nothing like that! He is not created!

Dawkins proceeds in his "Delusion", and I quote:

> *"Before Darwin, philosophers such as Hume understood that the improbability of life did not mean it had to be designed, but they couldn't imagine the alternative. After Darwin, we all should feel, deep in our bones, suspicious of the very idea of design"*
>
> *(Delusion, p.114)*

Now the only actual difference between atheistic philosophies before Darwin, and those that came after Darwin, is the shiny cloak of "science"! Not the idea of evolution itself, it's not Darwin's invention! It's the idea of natural selection and random mutation that moved the debate from the halls of philosophical academia and temple or church halls, to circles of natural science and laboratories! But did Darwin actually prove anything? No, he did not! He only made a proposition that was received so dearly and wholeheartedly by atheists of his time, and was so faithfully turned into a doctrine of 'science'! Darwin managed to offer to natural scientists a theory that whispers in the ear of every contemporary atheist saying: "You're right! Your faith in the metaphysical is the truth! There's nothing out there! Someone has finally postulated a coherent hypothesis that puts God out of the picture! It is legitimate science now! You can now be proud to be an atheist, and walk with your head high!"

Dawkins knows that neither Darwin nor anybody that followed on his path after him could ever actually *prove* anything that Darwin proposed to be a refutation of the meaning of creation! So the highest bid he can really put forth here is to say that Darwin's ideas made him "*suspicious of the very idea of design*", and that Darwin "*raised his consciousness*"!

Now if you ask me, I would say yes indeed, Darwin's theory altered an atheist's consciousness! It gravely ravished his sense of reason and language! And unfortunately, for the most of it, this is an irreparable damage! What can any man do to cure a mind that looks at things and believes, strongly, and on no rationally plausible basis whatsoever, that they are simply **not** the way they appear to be? And if observation – the very core of the scientific method – cannot be trusted, then what is the point in science

altogether? What can we possibly do to a man to convince him that this thing underneath his feet, upon which he is standing, is indeed the Earth?

Go ahead professor; be suspicious of whatever you don't like! Even the very meaning of truth itself, you will always find philosophers that have refuted it and "delusioned" it, so to speak! Just let your mind "go" and whatever it makes up for you, rest assured that you will find the works of some philosopher somewhere on your bookshelf to back it up for you!

Natural selection as a consciousness *ERASER*

Under the subtitle "Natural selection as a consciousness raiser" I quote Dawkins:

> *"'Unconscious' is exactly right. That is where consciousness-raising comes in". (pp. 115)*

I ask of every reasonable and sensible reader to notice how that after this vacuous campaign of pseudo-philosophy that he waged against the concept of "God" in the previous part, all that the professor can do now, is try to convince you that there is something somewhere in your "subconscious" level that has to be changed or "elevated" or perhaps "evolved" when you listen to the great teachings of Darwin, in order for you to accept them! You in fact may be getting convinced with Darwin's arguments, but unfortunately, this is only taking place somewhere beyond your consciousness; that's why you're somehow reluctant about it! So, you could either try to raise your consciousness high enough to grasp it, or you could just follow "the scientist" in your science class blindly and live on the hope that one day you will have it all figured out!

As you proceed reading this part, you'll find that the point he actually makes here can be portrayed with great fidelity in the thought that perhaps if you wrote down, for example, the word "designoid objects" underneath the images of a few animals and hanged them on a wall in your bedroom, then perhaps with time, long enough, (not as long as the timeline of natural

history I hope!), your consciousness will eventually elevate (evolve) high enough to grasp the Darwinist doctrine and accept it as it is!

So you see, the problem – as Dawkins teaches - is actually not with the theory of "natural selection" itself, but rather with our poorly evolved, (primitive if you may) and *deceptive* 'consciousness' as human beings! YOU, my respectable reader, are the problem!

It's the same age-old ruse of every preacher of 'nonsense' and irrational doctrine human history has ever known! '*If you can't swallow it, then you can rest assured that the problem is only with you!'*. He even seems to mould this sham in a much more outrageous and offensive cast, justifying it by means of evolution itself! You are now supposed to find justification for this irrationality and logical incoherence characteristic of the basic tenets of Darwinism, in the claim that we, humans, are only beginning to evolve (rationally) to the level where we could fully accept the Darwinian creed! A typical case of circular logic! An outrageous one for that matter! You can only understand and appreciate the rational argumentation for Darwinism, if your mind is sufficiently evolved according to Darwinism!

It's funny and interesting indeed how he mentions that the idea of conscious raising struck him when he contemplated feminist ideas! Why is it, he complains, that the English language is so inclined towards the use of the word "man", "mankind" and so forth in reference to the human race, and not the word "woman", although demographically there may indeed be more women on earth than men? Why is it not called "*womankind*"?

Well, it only appears to be a very reasonable question to a mind that works the way the professor's mind works! It appears to be a "consciousness raiser" (to use his own terminology) only to someone who finds it meaningful to wonder why it was called "history" rather than "herstory"! In which case it should actually be "hertory" not "herstory" by the way, putting "her" in place of "his", given that even by his own confession, the part "his" here has nothing to do with masculinity, but never mind that! It's to him a problem with the English language anyway! (And in fact all human

languages, as it happens!) A problem that made the "man" and the "his", take dominion in such linguistic uses over the "woman" and the "her"!

It is of course nonsense to attack language itself in such a way, even though it does not surprise me a single bit, for the entire faith of atheism (and correspondingly Darwinism) is founded – as we discussed in detail earlier - upon outrageous crimes against human language and reason! All humans have agreed in a total consensus in all languages on Earth, ever since the dawn of mankind, on using the masculine pronoun in almost every general reference to the kind, or the race to which we belong, or the particular communities to which they belong, and never before the "brilliant" philosophy of feminism came to emerge, did anybody, male or female, think of this as some sort of *unjust gender discrimination* or *offense to women*!

So why did they all accept it so easily, and never had any hard feelings about it? Because they were all sexists, under influence – perhaps – of some sexist religious doctrines or social orders? Absolutely not! It's because quite simply, even from a strictly biological and physiological view, males are equipped the way they are, physically and psychologically, to take over the duty of building the community outside the home; to take the dominion over the land and defend the territory, to enforce order and system, to enforce justice and penalty – as a social necessity, using their naturally equipped powers for the purpose, even in species other than human kind – and to act as representatives of the tribe and the community. Whereas females on the other hand are fully equipped for the other half of the job! The half that should naturally be none but the female's job to do! The soft half! That is, the job of the home, the children, and the establishment of the very institution that males work on protecting and preserving: The home!

So males and females – in the natural order of things - complete one another! They are two parts that complete one another, not *compete* with one another in any one of the two clearly and naturally distinct fields of work for the two distinct sexes! Each one of the two genders has its exclusively natural job and specialty that has been recognized as such by all sane humans ever since the dawn of mankind! The job of the male only happens to be the one that takes territorial dominion and collective power. This is

why, quite simply, all languages use the masculine pronoun in reference to the race itself, or to general duties or rights of people that are not exclusively feminine! And at that, when the male pronoun is used, we naturally understand that both males and females (both halves of the race) are included (unless it is something that is exclusively for males, which is then to be indicated in particular)!

This distinction of duties, my kind reader, in its abstract meaning, is not "unjust discrimination"! It is not "Sexism"! It is nature! Healthy men are always happy and satisfied to do a man's job, and healthy women – on the other hand – are equally satisfied and fulfilled as they do a woman's job! Not the other way round! Healthy women are always satisfied and fulfilled instinctually as the females they are, as they feel the dominion of a strong overpowering man upon them; the man they love and desire! No healthy woman in her right senses would deny her natural need to feel contained under the power of a strong man who protects her, fathers her babies and becomes the only male holder of the keys to her female love and her sexual intimacy! Women are **made** the way they are, to follow men and to find it absolutely satisfactory, not the other way round!

So this terminology is the natural linguistic expression of a pure, unstained human consciousness and understanding of the way nature works! It is the way any healthy mind would think, and would apply language, with no reservations whatsoever! It is the way humans are!

Now how do I know that? How do I see those purely rational and natural meanings so clear? I do, not because I am a philosopher who has just come up with those meanings as some theory of philosophy of his own making that may be adopted by some and attacked by others, and eventually washed away by the waters of time! I do because I have learnt wisdom from its only pure and absolutely true source: The true teachings of the creator of man Himself, the one who tells us why we are here; the one who knows best!

This is indeed the way every healthy mind should view the way men relate to women in the body of the human kind! Pure, clear and simple!

However, there came a point in the modern history of the Western world, when all givens of rational discourse were questioned and attacked! It was the explosion of an oppressed mob that went out destroying everything in a fit of rage! An onslaught and a rebel on everything that was inherited from previous generations, based on nothing but anger! It was a blind rebellion; yes it was a reaction to a false unjust authority, but it was an utterly blind revolution all the same!

In the absence of the heavenly light of wisdom, and in vicious reaction to the tyranny of a corrupt church domain, all forms of heritage were dismissed! Even language itself was "deconstructed"! People felt that something was wrong, and yes indeed, something was clearly wrong, in the order of society ruled by the Church! However, this – by no means of reason whatsoever – means that every meaning that is passed down through heritage in the western world or anywhere else is false, or should be annihilated in favor of experimenting "new ways of life"! This is the blindness and sheer loss of those who know not! It is not to be turned into a standard for judging those who do know or claim that they do!

Feminism is the embodiment of this ideological nothingness, this total rebellion against everything that people of old used to think about a woman, absolutely everything! It's like saying: *"Let's do away with everything that our parents taught us, and let's do whatever we like! If what they made up suited them, then let's make up something of our own that suits us better"*

It didn't quite matter at that point, that they didn't really know what other path to take instead and what other social orders to establish in place of that which they have chosen to abolish! There would always be "philosophers" who would work to fill in the gaps! It's like saying: *kill the enemy first, and ask questions later*! They would feel free at that point to try anything at all and see what it does to them! Everything that people of old used to teach them was to be placed is some museum box and displayed as "History"! In the secular world of the west, nothing is sacred; nothing is binding or obligatory anymore! "*Who are they – those elders - to force us to live the way they did?"*, they would say! Well; I couldn't agree more with the wisdom in constantly questioning the authority that is sometimes given

blindly to teachings of old and inherited laws! However, I condemn the very foundations of thought upon which those rebels founded their criticism and their eclectic attitude towards it!

To come to the conclusion that none of those laws of old is binding, and none of those stories or religions is anything but myth, and none of those orders is anything but the frail making of a primitive mind… is sheer extremism and blindness manifesting in an arbitrary reaction!

Based on what standards and laws did you make your judgment in the first place? And whatever gives your own manmade laws the upper hand over other equally manmade laws? Who gives you the right to even preach your innovations in this respect as though they were the truth, the path and the long awaited wisdom? Without an external reference that is unlike all others; one that is **evidently not manmade**; you are left with nothing but human try and error! Oh and what an error that would be!

You discover – after having done monumental damages to an entire human nation – that a certain law of punishment in the system of law that you devised for it was unfair, and that it caused more damage than cure, so what do you do? Instead of accepting the evidently perfect source of ultimate wisdom and justice that cannot be afforded by the limited mind of man (namely heavenly revelation in the true law of the Lord) once you have it revealed to you, you go on committing yet another similar crime, replacing that false "justice" with your own experimental "justice"! [21]

---

[21] When people listen to the truth – the only reasonably and perfectly rational truth – about their Lord preached by one of His prophets, and yet reject his teachings of wisdom and justice (which is by necessity of definition: Ultimate justice) and insist on going on with their own manmade systems of justice and morality, they are – by definition – doing themselves and their subjects **injustice**! But when they have not listened to any of the Lord's prophets, and have not acquired a way to learn this ultimate wisdom, and they had no choice but to try to figure it out on their own, they are not doing injustice to each other by agreeing (the distinguished philosophers among them) to a system they call justice and committing to it, even though in reality it may not *be* justice at all! This is necessary to note here so that the reader may not be mistaken to believe that since Justice by its definition only comes from the Lord, then by letting some people die without ever learning it from Him, He is doing them injustice! Absolutely not! He would only be doing them injustice by not letting them listen to a prophet's message in their nation only if He were to trial them in the afterlife for what rulings and judgments they made in this life according to their own minds in acquiring justice and establishing it amongst them, but unlike what Mu'tazilites believe, this is not the case! The Quran makes it clear in many occasions that the Lord only punishes in the afterlife only **after** He has sent a messenger (He punishes those who listen and reject)! So people of (Fatrah) – those who never received any messengers – will not be judged in the afterlife for what they called justice, since they

Wisdom my kind reader is to say: *let's examine the teachings of our parents, and see what proves to be wise and just, and what proves to be otherwise, and only eliminate that which is false and corrupt, taking the only evidently true body of wisdom and justice – that we know where we should expect to find - as our reference in doing so*! This comes, by necessity, not before one has acquired this basis of knowledge that defines right from wrong, and wise from unwise, on rigid and solid grounds of evidence!

But is this what feminism – for example – is founded upon? No! It's an extreme spiteful reaction to an extreme action, that's what it is! It's a rebellion against nature itself! Thus, it's blatantly stupid to claim that this question of linguistic terminology we just discussed is "unfair" or "unjust" or is the outcome of some form of evil gender discrimination! But this is what "Extremism" really is! It is plain stupid and unwise, and it has absolutely nothing to do with the path of prophets and the teachings given to them by the Lord! It is a blind uninformed unscholarly reaction!

Yes indeed there were many innovated orders that did wrong to a woman in the Dark Ages under the Church in Europe! In fact almost all laws of the Church were innovated (manmade) under the claim of (Holy Ghost) authority, and they lacked evidence from authentic heavenly revelation!

Why does a society – they would say - ask of a woman to stick to taking care of the kids – for example -, or to taking care of her husband, or to keep from provoking sexual desires by exposing her female charms (which are basically biological tools for reproduction) in places other than her bedroom

---

obviously did what they could, and they had no clue! They tried their best to achieve the closest thing they could to what justice is supposed to be, so even though it was not really justice, the Lord will not punish them for not acquiring the code of perfect justice: They did not have any way to acquire it on their own! But when they do have that **one** true way revealed to them (As an act of grace and special mercy from their Lord), and they do get a chance to listen to His messenger; it's all different then! They should know by necessity of reason that they cannot afford to place their own manmade conjectures of justice at the same caliber with what is indeed the teaching of their creator Himself in definition of Justice! And by insisting on keeping their manmade systems after the truth is revealed to them; they are – then - doing great injustice to each other, continuing to rule and judge amongst themselves by those laws of their own making, instead of the Lord's revealed laws! So bear in mind – my reader – that when I say that people who commit themselves and their followers to other laws than those of their creator are in fact doing great injustice to one another, this is in the context of our current status as human nations: a world that is indeed addressed by a perfect message of wisdom from its only true creator; a message that once received as it was originally reveled; it cannot be mistaken for what it really is!
I shall further my discussion on the concept of morality and justice in Volume two.

and to people other than her own wedded spouse, or even to being part of any such commitment as marriage to begin with? Feminism in its broad meaning is a rebellion not only against wisdom and everything that a healthy reasonable man cannot escape identifying as morality; it is a rebellion against everything that really gives the word “female” – not to mention “human” - its very own natural meaning!

But here we are, reading a man who finds great inspiration in the way “feminists” raised his consciousness, and questioned the norms of English language!

Now, I feel I have to excuse my reader since I may have started writing about this issue (the question of justice and morality), somehow early in this literature, for there shall come a chapter in Dawkins’ Delusion – and naturally my response to it - that addresses this issue exclusively, and it is there – in volume two - that we shall drive deeper and further into it; but I found myself compelled to write those words here nonetheless, as I was agitated by the way he speaks of how inspired he was by the “consciousness raising” that feminist approaches to language give him!

Just take a look at this statement:

> *“When I was young, it never occurred to me that women might feel slighted by a phrase like 'the future of man'.”* (The Delusion p.115)

Well, in fact, this only indicates how far away you have gone with Darwinism, professor, from the pure and natural way all humans would view those meanings! None but an atheist or a feminist man or woman (or a follower of any similar philosophy) would think of it this way! And the reason you did not find anything wrong with it back then, is not because you were illiterate or uneducated at the time, but because you were much closer to the pure sensibility of humans than you are today!

The future of “man” is naturally the future of both males and females of the human kind! As long as the discourse is not gender exclusive, it addresses – as a rule - all humans! If we said “the future of woman” instead; the mind would naturally and automatically take it to be an exclusively female issue!

The last thing that would come to your mind when you hear this word, even if you are an ardent feminist, - maybe **especially** if were indeed a feminist - is the fact that the speaker means the entire human race, not just women! He wouldn't use this word if that's what he meant! It's only natural that when we need to refer to human beings regardless of gender we use the masculine pronoun! This is also why any intelligent being – in general - is addressed by the masculine pronoun – by default – unless it has a gender and its gender is female! I mean even when people speak of those they claim to have been abducted by aliens, they naturally speak of the alien in male pronouns, even though it is possible in theory that it might be female or even asexual! Unless precisely informed that this is a female creature, they find no reason to use female pronouns. This is exactly why we address the Lord the creator in the masculine pronoun, because He has no gender; not because He is a male! This is just the way human language works! It's the way of all languages ever known to man! The same goes for His Angels; they are all addressed in the masculine pronoun because they have no gender! To use the female voice would only mean a particular gender; the soft gender that carries the babies and mothers them! This is what would naturally come to your mind. It is a rational meaning that language recognizes and expresses naturally: that women follow men, and that they are the "other sex", there's no degradation of women in this mere fact, and no woman – prior to the advent of feminism – ever felt offended by it!

So what Dawkins is doing here by invoking the impact of feminism on language, is like saying, if now you people no longer take this linguistic norm for granted (dealing with the words man and woman) – under influence of feminist philosophies – then you should not find the Darwinian language (dealing with the words design, chaos and so forth) improper or irrational either! It's just another step on the path of "raising human consciousness"!

So take a long breath, close your eyes, and keep "rising"!

He goes on to say:

> *"Natural selection not only explains the whole of life; it also raises our consciousness to the power of science to explain how organized complexity can emerge from simple beginnings without any deliberate guidance."*

What a monumental fallacy added upon an equally monumental lie! Natural selection explains "the whole of life"? I can't believe a proclaimed "scientist" could actually say that! What *an extremist* position towards a theory of biology! Even though he knows that the actual origin of life – for example – is not within the domain of natural selection, he still finds himself justified when he makes such a brave statement!

But forget about its origin, what about its actual meaning, its actual nature? What is "life" professor, in its very simplest of meanings? What is it that really separates a dead being from a living being on the onset of it, and what – on Earth – does Natural selection have to do with explaining that? I am so offended by the way he undermines the mentality of his reader in such a way! Does he think that the more he repeats his claims, over and over again, and the bigger he expands them as he goes, the more his reader will be convinced with their validity? Is this how he believes people's consciousness will be raised by Natural selection?

I may not have been that much astonished or offended if he said that it explains – for example – how certain species emerge from previous ancestral species, or even if he said "it explains how life emerged on earth" (and of course it does none of that, with regards to what he means by "explains", or to any other use of the word "explains" at all)! But to claim that it "explains the **whole of life**" …! How bold indeed!

He then boasts about the way he converted Douglas Adams, the radical atheist, and quotes his words, in an attempt to raise our consciousness the way he is so proud to have raised his!

Of course we then have to bear with him as he praises his prophet, his master Darwin, in attempt to show humility and attribute the "marvel" of the new religion to its true founder!

I quote:

> *"Darwin's discovery of a workable process that does that very counterintuitive thing is what makes his contribution to human thought so revolutionary, and so loaded with the power to raise consciousness." (The Delusion p. 117)*

What he calls "counter-intuitive" is in fact, **"counter-rational"** by every sense you can put in this word! It's in fact counter-linguistic as we explained! And oh yes indeed it is full of power to change people's understanding of life! It is so full of potential to destroy all norms of reason that define the human mind itself, and the way it works, and indeed it does! So clearly what he calls consciousness raising here, is actually consciousness inversion! Or should I say consciousness "*erasing*"?

Watch how he speaks of Fred Hoyle:

> *"At an intellectual level, I suppose he understood natural selection. But perhaps you need to be steeped in natural selection, immersed in it, swim about in it, before you can truly appreciate its power." (The delusion p.117)*

Oh yes indeed you do! Just like all forms of irrational fallacies that have ever come to stain the cloth of human knowledge (and in this particular case: Burn it)! Just as it is the case with every false religion or false tenets of faith in some false divinity! You need to believe, so strongly, that with time and constant sincere effort, you will eventually be blessed by understanding it and overcoming the clearly irrational tenets it is built upon, and your consciousness will eventually rise high enough to grasp it! Like I said earlier, you'd listen to the very same 'apology' from a priest of a false religion, telling you; "it's all rational! It all makes perfect sense! You just have to work your way with it a little harder and you will eventually capture it! Perhaps you need to do more prayer!"

Yes indeed, if you are to convert to the religion of Darwin, you do need to immerse yourself in it, from head to toe, just as it is the case with every false religion! You need to get yourself baptized in fossils and the writings of Darwinian *apologists*, answering to their rivals from other faiths! And under the canopy of a heart that strongly desires to see it as the truth, and is strongly urged to search for a way out of any other faith you hate to see yourself embracing, you will have room in your life to accept the religion of Darwin and accept his "counterintuitive" conceptions and even start fighting for them! You just need to be motivated; and it's then, only a matter of time before you have fully converted!

Well, I ask, had it been the truth, the meaning that fits in ease and perfect simplicity with the way man understands words and reasons what he perceives in the world, the meaning that you should truly feel makes perfect sense at all levels, would it have demanded such an "immersion" and painful struggle before one could really "appreciate its power"? I think not!

The truth is not at all challenging to understand! It cannot be "counterintuitive"! To counter our intuition is to counter the very tool by which we make sense of things, and by which we know the truth to be what it is: the truth! What confidence should we then have in the very way we see things or reason things? What meaning would we then still keep for anything that is science, knowledge, or even "understanding" and "conception" in our notion of the world around us? What sense should we then have in the very meaning of truth itself, if to accept it, we have no choice but to counter our own natural intuition and reverse the tuning of our mind; our very own natural tool of understanding and judging?

How pathetic is a preacher who has no better argument to offer now to convince his followers with his teachings, than ask them to "raise their consciousness" on the hope that eventually they could "counter their intuition" and accept his claims!

Once you've managed to see the black white and the white black, the right wrong and the wrong right, the positive negative and the negative positive, the perfect imperfect, and the orderly chaotic; you've boosted your

consciousness to the level where you can really appreciate Natural Selection! It takes time, effort, training and exercise of course, but it's absolutely worth it, says our preacher here!

I say – and I hope I no longer need to say it - the truth has to be in perfect accordance with every standard of human reason; no conscious countering or alteration or immersion demanded! Its perfect rationality is, by definition, part of the many things that make it the truth! We should not have to swim or fly or jump or dig or do any such crazy thing on the hope that one day we may fully understand it and appreciate it!

Apparently, my kind reader, we are now going through the part of Dawkins' book where the priest is doing everything in his power to cover up for the messy and irrational tenets of the corrupt faith he is preaching! *"Raise your consciousness and you will accept it!"*

He then carries on another "smoke cloud" effect, in attempt to convince the reader that what he means by "consciousness raising" is actually the same effect that any reader of scientific literature would get when he reads any brilliant idea that any scientist has ever proposed to his field of science! Well, I say, by what sense of reason could the theory of natural selection be analogized in its rationality to the example he gives here when he speaks of the way we have come to realize how tiny we are in the great vast universe, thanks to the contributions of astronomers like Hoyle? Yet among the examples he gives, he fails not to quote some atheist scientists as they claim that their consciousness arose **only** when they let go of religion (or the supernatural agent), and who celebrate the influences that Darwinism has had on their fields of theory!

He then proceeds to criticize a sect of Christian biologists (Old-Earth creationists and the likes) who find it acceptable to propose that evolution, even natural selection, is "the way" the Lord created living species! Yes it is indeed one pathetic position to take, I agree! And it is a natural outcome of a profound weakness of argumentation and of knowledge of the truth! I do sympathize with them though, because despite the corrupt image they made

up, at least they still respected their own minds, and held on tight to the way human rationality works, and to the rational and intuitive necessity of there being a supreme creator beyond all this, and they persistently refused – which is what Dawkins condemns the most about them – to "counter" their reason, bite their tongues and let go of the concept of "God" entirely! They refused to "raise their consciousness" the way he teaches, for the sake of Darwinism!

But let me ask you this, my kind reader: for a man who holds some corrupt theology in his religion about the creator, believes his book to be open to any new interpretation that suits him best, accepts the general concepts of evolutionism, and sees the rational necessity of there being an external initiator, coordinator and sustainer even for a pathetically irrational process like natural selection, what is it really that an atheist could hold against him when he claims that natural selection may be the very means by which the creator created new species?

Nothing! He would easily accuse him of failing to understand Natural selection, because by "natural", Darwin actually meant "self operated", "self maintained"; an operation that needed no external force to initiate or to run it! But then, how can the atheist prove this position of his to be true about evolution or natural selection?

Suppose I told you I'm prepared to accept natural selection, only if you proved to me that there is no other collective universal law or force beyond the visible universe that runs it according to a collective plan that makes it appear to us the way it does, could you – the atheist – do that? Forget about the rational necessities here, let's just say that I've managed to "raise my consciousness" to the desired level where I could accept the proposition that there is no initiator or keeper anywhere, and that there could be a system without a designer! What evidence can you offer me now at that point? Or am I supposed to accept and believe in it only because it appears to be "an elegant" "simplistic" theory that just might be a good alternative to the concept of creation, and because Darwin finally managed (according to your faith) to offer a proposition that leaves us in no "need" to "propose" a "designer"? Is that it?

Well, yes! That's it! At the end of the day, atheists do admit that they have no evidence to prove that there is no creator! So all they're really asking is that you "fall in love" with Darwinism on one hand, and "hate" all religions on the other, and join their pathetic club! Which is in fact the reason why Dawkins wrote and chaptered his "Delusion" here the way he did!

He plays his game in the book in this order:

- First, you – the reader – are to be shaken with doubt by means of the attempted refutation of some theologians' and philosophers' arguments for the existence of "God",

- then you are to be shown that one might as well believe in a spaghetti monster or a flying tee-pot revolving around our planet, and that you have no evidence to prove that your god is this god not that god, (which is of course true for all false religions),

- then you're made to believe that Natural selection is not at all a bad idea, and that it gives you a "consciousness raising" alternative that gets you out of the embracing position where you fail to prove that your god is the true god and your faith is the true religion,

- then you are bombarded with quotations from atheist scientists celebrating Darwin's ideas, and introduced to the idea that you have to "elevate" your consciousness to fully accept those ideas! If you wish to join the elites of academia, this is your ticket!

- Then you're bombarded with a barrage of accusations against various religious texts (both, truly corrupted texts along with texts misunderstood by an uneducated author) that leaves you incapable of defending your false faith whatever it is… and that's it!

The author believes that at that point, you will have no choice but to believe that there can be no creator, and that all religions on earth are plain myth and bedtime stories all the same, and that you will not need to ask for any more evidence for atheism! This is all that he has to offer, and to justify the twist or "countering" of reason and intuition he's asking you to do here in order to accept Darwinism and become an atheist!

So, as a matter of fact, although I pity those “middle-ground” creationists he laments here and the flimsy theoretical compromise they attempted to make, I find them to be far more true to themselves and to their minds than evolutionist atheists!

If I were in a position where I have two theories before me to select from, one that embraces a “creator” with certain details about Him that make no sense, and another that denounces the creator altogether, and I have no evidence on any of the two sides, I would easily tend not to deny the clear rational necessity of there being a creator, and I would not choose to let go of it for the sake of the other position that counters basic reason by denying the creator altogether! Moreover, I may even find it a plausible position to amalgamate the two approaches one way or another, and find me some middle grounds to stand! I will have gathered – in doing so – whatever rational pros I may see in both positions, and evaded the cons!

Now, what part of such a process of theorization do Darwinians view as false or unwelcome, and why? In reality the only reason they will have to reject such a proposition, is because it puts “God” back into a model they believe they have finally managed to get Him out of (which they did not of course)! The only reason why they accept and fight so strongly for Darwinism is their claim that it offers a plausible explanation that needs no intelligent determinate agent in the beyond to justify it! And we have effectively proven that this is absolutely false; and that even as pathetic as it is, it still necessitates such an agent!

Even with this pathetically corrupt story they propose for natural history, they cannot escape the necessity of a governing intelligence! I always like to say that instead of disproving God, all that Darwinians do is actually attribute “ignorance”, “blindness” and “erroneousness” to Him, denying Him much of His attributes, in attempt to restrain Him, (May He be praised) because whatever they do, they cannot escape the clearly rational meaning of order and governance, and its naturally corresponding meaning of intelligence in whatever story or model they propose! They cannot even **speak** against it, without having to bite their tongues!

It is thus quite understandable, how and why philosophers of materialism, as mentioned by Dawkins here, believed that the more natural laws they discover, the less it leaves “God” anything to do! They believe that once we prove – for example – that lightning is caused by natural causes, then “God” is put out of this process, and has nothing to do with it! Now what kind of reason is this? How do believers in Him think of Him and the way He relates to the world, and according to what system of faith and what evidence to begin with? The “god of the gaps” image is only true, as we discussed in another section, to particular systems of faith; basically pagan religions, or ones with pagan influences (like Christianity), where corrupted texts, written by ignorant men, not inspired by the true creator, naturally allow for new discoveries to refute those texts!

The reason for this position by materialists as I pointed out in an earlier section, is the pagan image of “god” as some super human being laying over a cloud, doing this part of the process that scientists discovered is actually done by means of humidity, air pressure, temperature, and other “natural causes”! What they fail to realize is that this pathetic image of a god is already self-evidently false and corrupt! Any sane man needs not see scientists discovering that there is no council of gods somewhere atop the Olympus, or palace of Zeus above a cloud there, to realize the basically corrupt reasoning underneath this pagan imagery of the deity!

Nevertheless, this conception of a pagan god that *hides somewhere within* the universe, in gaps of scientific knowledge, waiting for some discovery to disprove him and get him out of the picture sooner or later, is what encouraged some of them to claim that if indeed there is a god, then he must be doing little next to nothing at all, in running the Universe!

What they fail to realize is that the ways of the supreme creator, in the light of the perfect attributes that He should be expected to have, must be, by all means, out of any form of analogy to the human ways! The way the entire universe is – by pure reason – expected to be maintained and run is not in such a pathetically anthropomorphic image, so pathetic that they expect to see – for example - a human figure of a god blowing the winds from behind

the mountain, and once they prove that some other physical phenomenon causes the winds to move, they rejoice in proving that there is no creator!

All natural and physical causes we know and those we yet know not are governed and controlled by metaphysical forces that are created and constantly maintained exclusively by the Creator of the system from beyond! Lordly control does take place from far beyond the visible universe, over each and every cause and effect that takes place in it and on all levels, but it certainly is not in the form of some white bearded old guy lying over some cloud, doing what pagan religions imagine their pity deities to be doing! The keeper sustainer of this infinite universe is to be praised high above this pathetic imagery, or any other humanly affordable image for that matter! This is a necessity of reason, and it is indeed what Islam teaches.

So how does He run the Universe? How does he do it from far beyond all those levels of natural causes? Well, we don't know, we cannot know and we need not know! It's quite **okay** not to know that, and it's quite natural that we couldn't! We are obviously not here on this earth to create universes and play gods on them! All we can figure out by the tools of our science is a series of those natural causes from our small earthly end of the process, causes that we were only enabled – by creation - to learn and discover, for the sake of the purpose for which we were made into this world!

So to sum it all up, I'm not at all in favor of what those so called "Old-Earth creationists" are claiming; there is no "middle ground" or "compromise" between truth and fallacy! God is not a witless being who knows not what He's doing, may His names be praised! A system built on inherent chaos is obviously not the work of a perfect creator, and is obviously not the way the universe is actually built. Holders of the truth accept no "half-true, half-false" stances! The only authority of knowledge from which we may take any valid account of origins of species and of all creation is the true revelation of the creator Himself, and no other! I was only making the point that evolutionists, who have no choice but to believe in a "blind watchmaker" beyond it all, couldn't possibly have any solid argument by which to refute those people's position, just as well as they have none to validate their own!

Reducing the Irreducible, denying the undeniable!

In the section subtitled by (Irreducible Complexity) Dawkins is turning his campaign against every Biologist who was ever true to his human sensibility, as he attributes irrationality to a concept that shouldn't need to be proven true for any man with two eyes and a healthy mind!

I quote:

> *"It is impossible to exaggerate the magnitude of the problem that Darwin and Wallace solved. I could mention the anatomy, cellular structure, biochemistry and behaviour of literally any living organism by example. But the most striking feats of apparent design are those picked out - for obvious reasons - by creationist authors, and it is with gentle irony that I derive mine from a creationist book." (Delusion p.119)*

It is interesting to see how he talks about these aspects: "*the anatomy, cellular structure, biochemistry and behaviour of literally any living organism"* in a way that makes them appear as though they are somehow "lesser" aspects or do not appear to be as well designed as other aspects in certain living organisms that he views to be "the most striking feats of apparent design"!

I have no choice but to wonder here, by what datum or standard of reasoning does he, and all other refuters of what they call "Irreducible complexity" or "Intelligent Design", make such a distinction in organic systems, applying the two words "simple" and "complex" as they do? Clearly, if by simple they mean – for example – that such a "simple" living being could somehow be simulated or mimicked by some manmade artifact, making an exact copy of that "simple" living being, then indeed they are fooling themselves!

We do not need to challenge them to create something as small as an ATP synthase: A tiny enzyme (a couple of nanometers thick) in the living cell that was recently discovered and is known as the Mitochondrial ATP Synthase (which is a 1997 Noble prize discovery by the way)! I urge my unfamiliar reader to google it up and see what it is! In brief, it's a tiny biochemical

motor with a part that revolves at about 6,000 rpm (100 rounds per second) to produce ATP molecules (adenosine triphosphate) from ADP (adenosine diphosphate), which is only one of thousands of unbelievably complex reactions taking place in the metabolism of a '*simple'* cell! [22]

So what is it then? How do they define "simple"? What is their datum of reference? The number of organs, perhaps? In fact, I would be far more amazed to see a unicellular organism performing a great deal of those organic functions that our own bodies perform, all in a single cell, than in a multitude of organs articulated in the way we observe in multi-cellular beings! And on this datum of reference, I say such organisms are certainly **not** at all simple! Just take a look at the kind of riddle the way an organism as tiny as the Amoeba moves around underwater and the amazing way it performs its organic functions! After two centuries of studying this "simple" organism, we still know very little about – for example - the way it produces those (pseudopods) with which it moves and the way it navigates and knows where it is in a water pond (hence decides on which way to go, given that it has no top-side or bottom-side, no left from right, and obviously no "eyesight")!

So what is the datum for a certain living being to be described as "simple", as opposed to another that is "complex"? You mean something that is in itself, *amazingly* complex, but is relatively and apparently less complex than other larger beings? So the rule here is actually no more than a subjective

[22] The more science advances, the much more indeed any sane self respecting man would realize the magnitude of such a challenge! In the Qur'an, the Lord challenges mankind to create something as tiny as a fly or a gnat!

I quote (translation of meanings):

2|26| ((Allah disdains not to make an example of a gnat, or even tinier...))

22|73| ((O mankind! An example is coined, so pay heed to it: Those unto whom ye call beside Allah will never create a fly even if they gathered up for the purpose. And if the fly should take anything away from them, they could not recover it. So weak is the seeker and the sought!))

May those who honestly seek the truth be guided to it! Amen.

sense of *amazement*, based on the amount of knowledge you may currently possess! What datum is that?

Well, the notion of "complex" here is actually used due to the fact that instead of its being a single cell – for example – that does everything; a multi-cellular organism is a structure of a variety of types of cells with far more bodily functions, the thing that is assumed to reflect on the amount of data in the DNA! Now, I may have no problem – for now - with this relative description of complexity among living beings, in the light of my currently limited knowledge – as a human - of those less complex beings. However, does this conception justify the way an atheist biologist views certain organisms to be "less evolved" or somehow "primitive"?

You have two living beings that are equally perfect in the way they function and adapt to their locales, to the way they live, and to their place in nature, and are both extremely complex, yet one of them is obviously much more complex in terms of organic structure! Now, the question is this: By what reason or code of scientific integrity, does a scientist allow himself to call one of these beings "primitive" or "less-evolved" and the other "complex" or "evolved" and explain that difference the way Darwinians do, only because he views one of them to exhibit more organic complexity (in terms of cell structure and DNA) and more bodily functions than the other one? In other words, how does he allow himself to claim that the more complex being is – by necessity – "an advancement" or "evolution" above the level of the other less complex being?

Evolution in what? In the craft of making complex beings? Whoever said that the more "complex" an organism becomes (whatever your definition of "complex" here), the longer or better it will survive or fit in its particular place in nature? Whoever said that a certain degree of complexity that we see in certain organisms is conditional for other organisms as well, to survive and to adapt perfectly to their place in nature?

The only objectively acceptable datum to judge any artifact is that of the function and the purpose! A craft that is one bit more or less complex than it has to be in order to fulfill its purpose and do its job, is imperfect (i.e. needs

to be evolved)! And the “evolution” or the “development” that should come to replace it does not by necessity have to be more complex for that end; it may actually have to be less complex! If evolution is not following any particular plan, and is all based on the selection of random mutations, then whoever said it always has to go up, rather than down, on a relative scale of complexity?

The point is that as long as a less complex being is performing its job perfectly, it is not to be called “primitive” or “less evolved”, and there clearly is no sense of reason in claiming that there was once a time when it had to evolve, or in describing further complexity in the light of its function and purpose as an “upgrade” or “an evolution”! Obviously it never had to evolve or to become any more complex than it is now, because here it is, breeding and functioning in perfectness, side to side with other beings that we describe as more complex!

So the question is this: Does my currently limited understanding – as a human - of the way a certain organic system works, or the way a certain being functions in its locale, or the mere fact that it is less complex than other beings, give me the right to describe it as “simple”, “primitive” or “un-evolved”? Is this attitude by Darwinians not – in itself – some form of compound ignorance [23] and of worshipping the gaps? Yes indeed it is!

You do have gaps – huge gaps - in your knowledge and you do admit it! However, instead of placing some pagan deity there, you are actually placing

[23] Scholars of Islam (‘ulema’) identify two levels of ignorance: simple ignorance, and compound ignorance! Simple ignorance (Aljahlul Baseet الجهل البسيط) is the state of knowledge when a man knows that he doesn’t know! While compound ignorance (Aljahlul Murakkab الجهل المركب) is when he doesn’t know that he doesn’t know, or in other words: he thinks he knows! I will not be exaggerating if I said that never in my life have I seen an ignorance that is more compound than this! And guess what; It’s actually getting more complex in Darwinians with time! It’s “evolving”! Not in his wildest dreams could Darwin himself back in his time, imagine that such a book as “The God Delusion”, would one day emerge, going this far in attempting to apply his theories in refuting the existence of the creator, where the author would commit such horrendous assaults on reason and language in Darwin’s name! Not that I’m saying that he was not an ardent atheist himself! It’s just that by a simple comparison of “The Origin of Species” to titles like “The Selfish Gene” or to “The God Delusion”, you’d actually understand what I mean when I say that compound ignorance does indeed evolve with time!

Natural Selection in those gaps; your own worshipped god, a blind god of chaos! "The selfish gene did it by natural selection"! You're claiming that since certain beings appear to you, in your limited knowledge, to be "simple", then they are indeed "less evolved", or "primitive"!

Now I'm not asking you – my atheist reader - to place some deity down there instead, say that it did it, and quit trying to obtain valuable knowledge about such beings! Absolutely not! The Lord the true creator is praised high above such paganism and ignorance, and the more we Muslims – people of true wisdom - learn about life the more signs we see of His majesty, His mastery and His perfect attributes! I'm only reminding you of the limited nature of human knowledge as opposed to the infinitely stunning magnitude of perfectness in every part of this universe within which we live, a perfectness that reveals more and more of its aspects to our limited senses and tools every day!

By Darwinian gaps I mean gaps in our currently limited human knowledge of the actual degree of complexity in biological systems that Darwinians seek to explain and use as evidence for their myths and tales! They would still insist on calling certain organisms "simple" no matter how much unbelievable complexity new advancements of science would reveal in them! They would continue to describe them as *primates* that come at the bottom of their mythical evolutionary ladder nonetheless!

They judge living beings from the position of one who thinks he knows! They think that they have the right to call a unicellular organism (for example) "simple" and hence trace its origins to something even "simpler", only because compared to other more compound creatures, it appears to be less complex! This claimed mastery or beauty of Natural selection necessitates in order for a man to accept it, among many other irrationalities, that you attribute *simplicity* and actually inefficiency to such amazing tiny creatures they so arrogantly call "primitive" or "primates"!

He doesn't yet know, he doesn't yet understand; yet it's so easy for him to say "random" or to say "primitive" or to say "simple", describing what may

indeed be one of nature's wonders! And they claim science teaches them humility!

I couldn't resist quoting this statement by the author:

> *"The greater the statistical improbability, the less plausible is chance as a solution: that is what improbable means."(Delusion p.119)*

As I elaborated in a previous section, neither the proper meaning of "mathematical improbability" (*hence its applicability in this particular discourse or query of research, and the conclusions it leads to*) nor that of "chance" (*as the current lack of human ability to identify purpose or function for some part of a given system that is not of man's own design*) does them any good at all! Yet I know that the professor is one of thousands of theorists that would readily take such a statement for granted, and never even think twice about it, and would easily, so easily, - as open minded as they claim to be - dismiss such a fundamental philosophical objection from my part; no questions asked!

The distinction he then makes between natural selection and chance is indeed "counter-rational" if I may say, not just "counterintuitive"!

> *"But the candidate solutions to the riddle of improbability are not, as is falsely implied, design and chance. They are design and natural selection." (Delusion p.119)*

Well yes indeed! Natural selection, professor, is not chance; it's a masterful mechanism where only fitting codes survive, in what is actually nothing but a **long recurring accidental accumulation of Millions of "Chance Events"** (random yet favorable mutations) that have spanned tens of millions of years in gradual accumulation, safely working on turning life into the splendid unbelievably perfect thing that we see today! Millions of amazingly "lucky" and "constructive" mutations that all by pure "chance" happened to fall, each and every single one of them, in the right place, before it was too late!

Now as for where the very definition – formula or binding law – that determines fit from unfit, - according to which selection takes place - comes from and how it came to be in the first place; it doesn't matter!

So make no mistake now! It's not the straight jump by a single act of "chance" up the mountain; it's rather a long fascinating step by step (Chance by chance) progress sliding up slowly and determinately on a very long slope!

Just who on Earth are they really trying to fool?

Well, basically themselves! What this book and other similar books are really about, is a desperate attempt by its authors not initially to convert their readers - which is of course the end goal here - but to get out of writing it convinced – deep in their own hearts – one way or another, that they do have an excuse in dying as atheists! And they never will! They never will find satisfaction in any of their arguments no matter how many times they repeat them or how loudly they declare them, because they do realize the challenge they are posing against human reason itself, and the fact that they have no proof whatsoever to stand upon! So they write, publish, and propagate, and the more applause they get, and the more "ratings" and followers those books earn them, the more they find comfort pretending – in attempt to deal with their personal 'cognitive dissonances' – that it proves – or at least justifies – their position! They so much want to believe those fallacies that they actually end up believing them! They would say to themselves: "*If I can so easily convince so many people and change the way they see things; then I must be right*!"

After all, what is the central argument of this very book in our hands here (The God delusion)? The argument upon which professor Dawkins dared to draw the conclusion that the entire idea of "God" and "creation" is nothing but delusion and nonsense? Apart from the age old red-herring of regress, he is offering us an argument from "**improbability**"! All that he gives you after such a huge antagonizing campaign against basic foundations of human reason, intuition and even language; all you come out with in the end, is that the "concept" of "God" is highly "*unlikely*"! So what has he really done?

Other than shaking the naïve, the uneducated and those who believe in a false deity or who follow a fundamentally irrational system of faith; what on Earth has he really managed to prove? Nothing at all! It's the sour fight to "convince himself" before others that as an atheist; he is holding on to something! Self-justification is the right word here! So typical of every preacher of false beliefs!

I quote:

> *"Design is not a real solution either, as we shall see later…"(Delusion p. 120)*

I wonder; a real solution to what exactly, professor? Design is not a solution? Can you even begin to imagine a problem to which the right answer or solution is not a "design" or a "plan" or a predetermined system of some kind? Are we really supposed to go *this* far with our "consciousness raising" in order to make sense of Darwinism? To accept the rational and epistemic disaster in this phrase: "*Design is not a real solution*"?

By solution he obviously means an explanation that he accepts for the "improbability" that he sees in the origination of those amazing and astounding creatures. What – then – is the other alternative in the eye of the beholder for something that is perfectly orderly and systematic (hence rationally necessitating meanings like creation, Design and Plan in describing it) as an "explanation" for the way it came about?

Listen to this comment that he makes on the words of a creationist writer:

> *"'Did all of this happen by chance? Or did it happen by intelligent design?' Once again, no of course it didn't happen by chance. Once again, intelligent design is not the proper alternative to chance." (Delusion p. 120)*

I ask of every reasonable self-respecting reader to tell me now; what is this comment if not a desperate attempt to make people accept the meaningless claim that Natural selection is neither "design", nor "un-design"? It's like saying: "*You people have to believe in Natural selection because it neither demands a supreme maker / keeper (like in perfect creation), nor is it*

something that defies man's commonsense (like in mere chance)! If you do not wish to believe in any deity whatsoever, then this theory should work for you! So go ahead, embrace it and put it in the place of religion!"

He's not asking you to embrace "chance" because very clearly no matter what he does he cannot pass it through to you; yet he cannot make you think of it as some *process* of "design" or "plan" either! If the word "Designoid" makes any sense to you, then what are you waiting for? Go ahead and become a Darwinian!

Forget about "evidence" gentlemen! This is what he's doing here! This is what it's all about! Indoctrination! He's only trying to make you a believer, like he is, not convince you that it is true by means of evidence!

> *"Natural selection is not only a parsimonious, plausible and elegant solution; it is the only workable alternative to chance that has ever been suggested" (Delusion p. 120)*

Might as well write a poem on Natural selection, professor, on the hope that people's consciousness may eventually "rise" to meet its "standard"!

> *"Intelligent design suffers from exactly the same objection as chance. It is simply not a plausible solution to the riddle of statistical improbability. And the higher the improbability, the more implausible intelligent design becomes." (Delusion p. 120)*

Does this argument, by any standards of reason, qualify as evidence, one that justifies denying a basic rational and intuitive necessity? We are supposed to prepare ourselves now to accept the "fact" that the concept of design and purpose in nature is equal in its defects to that of pure chaos and "chance"!

So what exactly is "the riddle of statistical improbability" that he claims "design" not to solve anyway?! It is indeed the true delusion here!

Just get "probability" out of the picture and then we can start debating on the grounds of rational and considerable evidence!

What is probability and improbability in its very concept? What is it about?

He obviously finds no problem repeating himself, and neither do I!

So let me explain it again!

Probability is the mathematical assessment we give to the degree of likelihood of something to take place under certain observable conditions, as one of various observable possibilities (sample space), based on our observations of previous similar (analogous) processes in nature! Simply put, it's like saying: "Well, since I do not know on what side the coin will rest when I flip it and why, I can only say that there are two equally probable possibilities for the outcome that could be expected!" Long experimentation of tossing coins may be taken to suggest that both outcomes are – overall – equally probable.[24]

So by what reason can we presume the concept of probability or improbability to be characteristic of the order or power that yielded the origination of nature and life itself? What on Earth does this tool of mathematics have to do with the question of the Origin of life on Earth?! We formulated this concept to examine how likely certain observable events are to take place, according to previous experience! It is a tool of statistical presumption (best guess so to speak) that is based on our limited observation of the way certain events usually recur in nature around us, events we yet have no reliable knowledge of a standard law that governs them! It is a clear statement – in its very nature – that we do not know; we're only guessing!

[24] Please note that I have been avoiding the use of philosophical jargon throughout this literature as much as I could, to make sure that the book addresses all levels of education in all different disciplines of knowledge that I had to tackle with along the way. It should also be clear to professional philosophers that I'm not bound by strict formulations and wordings of different theories that I may have approached in my discourse in this book as I delve deep with my discussion and criticism to the conceptual foundations of such theories. Thus I deliberately avoid concerning my reader with the name of this or that theory, or with its common philosophical statement verbatim! It's the concept that really matters. So as much as the conception of probability concerns me and my reader here, I'm not in the business of spilling more ink and doubling the size of two already engorged volumes, to explain the difference between – for example - a "frequentist" and a "bayesian" philosopher, in this particular context! My philosophically uneducated reader could easily find that information somewhere else if he feels that he needs to! I couldn't care less – on the other hand - if much of what he reads here is not to be found in any textbook of philosophy that he may have read; the validity of an argument is judged only by its evidence, not by how much it agrees with the beliefs of this or that philosopher, no matter how mainstream they may currently be! And if this is not your attitude my respectable reader (whatever your scholarly background) then it's unlikely that you're going to accept much of what I have to offer here, and perhaps it will not be a very good idea that you carry on reading this book!

Probability does not propose a standard law or rule! It’s just a guess by means of statistical observation of **analogous scenarios**! We just propose that since the majority of apparently similar cases went (A) then this case is more likely to go (A) than (B) for example.

You say "intelligent design" suffers from Statistical improbability? Just how many cases of creation of the universe and of natural life from dead matter have you ever witnessed, professor? How many cases of origination of natural life on similar planets have you ever seen? How much observation data have you gained from similar cases under similar conditions that enable you to presume that it is “highly improbable” under those conditions (that you cannot even imagine to begin with) that life would have emerged by means of intelligent design?!

I repeat that this is just another example of fundamentally corrupt reasoning that they apply in postulation and deduction and easily call science!

This "riddle" of improbability thus can only be suffered in a mind deeply corrupted by the teachings of Darwin! A mind that does not care to revise the very meanings of the terms it applies!

> *“And the higher the improbability, the more implausible intelligent design becomes”* (Delusion p. 120)

Oh yes indeed, the higher your “consciousness rises”, the higher the “improbability” that words would mean to you what they actually mean! We have effectively demonstrated that even by their conception of improbability, the Darwinian story is supposed to be billions of times more improbable than a single act of willful creation!

> *“Seen clearly, intelligent design will turn out to be a redoubling of the problem. Once again, this is because the designer himself (/herself/itself) immediately raises the bigger problem of his own origin. Any entity capable of intelligently designing something as improbable as a Dutchman's Pipe (or a universe) would have to be even more improbable than a Dutchman's Pipe. Far from terminating the vicious regress, God aggravates it with a vengeance.”*

I suppose my reader has noticed by now, how it is that every time Dawkins fails to create a new argument for his faith, he rebounds – over and over again – to the same "infinite regress" argument and the very same question "Who created the creator"! As a matter of fact, it never fails to amaze me how he and his followers fail to see the magnitude of the crime they are actually committing against human reason, even as they make the statement that "the improbability is redoubled"!

First, let me wipe off a particular pagan imagery that reveals itself in these words "the designer himself/herself/itself"! As I pointed out earlier, the creator has no gender, He's neither male nor female; There's nothing like Him! Reproduction is an organic function that He created in living mortal beings for the preservation of their kinds and for the wisdom of what they are all made to do in the world, the place where every living being that is given life should eventually die! It is only a property of His created system and is not to be attributed to Him; the omnipotent, the omniscient, the eternal! Of course this is a tenet of Islam, and a basic rational necessity for the attributes of perfectness that a human mind should accept no less, for the creator of everything!

So there is no "herself" here! This is because as I pointed out earlier, when you refer to an entity in the female pronoun, you are indicating gender; you're talking about a female being! The Lord almighty is praised above gender altogether; be it male or female! He's not an "it" either! "It" is used in English for unconscious things! So there's no linguistic choice but to use the "He" and the "himself" pronouns, bearing in mind that He has no gender, given the fact that all human languages use the masculine pronoun for intellectual beings free from any sexual or gender associations, as elaborated earlier.

Second, by what reason do you allow yourself to view His existence as a problem? Define 'problem'!

If by "problem" you mean we cannot understand what His attributes are like or examine or reason how they are, then the problem is actually only in your own mind! Because nobody said that **we need to explain him**! We only

need to understand the way this system to which we are restricted works, and what we are here to do with it! He is not part of that system!

There's nothing in His creation that is anything like Him! Attributes of the Sole almighty creator are by necessity of reason, nothing like those of His creatures! The knowledge is nothing like our knowledge, the power is nothing like our power, and whatever we learn from authentic scripture that is among His attributes, is by necessity of reason – and according to scriptural evidence - unlike anything we have ever seen in a creature! So it is fundamentally wrong to ask "What is He **like**", or to chase a purpose of knowledge of understanding how He is!

This arrogant (but not surprising) attitude towards the creator destroys the rationally essential meaning of His being the uncreated creator (end of regress) – please revise in earlier sections of this book why it is rationally essential - because simply, if there was any way for man to know **how** the attributes of the Creator work (in the meaning that natural scientists give to the word "explain"); then it should follow by necessity that those attributes and properties are analogous to the way creatures in this world work and the way they are composed, simply because this is the only way our minds understand the way things around us work; analogy and analysis of composed systems! And this in turn will only mean that this creator is **created** and a composed system himself like all created things; which is again not true of the creator of all created things!

This is why pure and simple reason necessitates that we, the humans, cannot chase such a query or obtain knowledge thereof: What exactly He is like or How He is (The How question)! We only know about His attributes what He teaches us in His truly inspired words and the words of His true messengers… but to ask for more, or to ask for knowledge of how those attributes are, is to claim a forbidden claim that our minds cannot even begin to process or absorb!

Thus we say that the claim that such knowledge is achievable to man is a claim that contrasts every meaning that pure human reason is compelled to attribute to the creator! It is a claim that turns Him into yet another element

of this universe; analogous to creatures of His own making; which is a meaning that is by every sense in any healthy mind: false!

So there really is no "problem" at all for believers in the creator to solve! We cannot afford it, and we are not supposed to suffer it! This is not what our minds are made to do! It's sad that a man would waste his entire lifetime enjoying the ability to search and theorize, without even knowing what he was given those faculties for! No matter how brilliant this man proves to be in whatever he does with his mind; he is at the absolute antonym of wisdom!

Imagine a man who is given a fancy car, top tech, with GPRS equipment and computerized navigation and so forth, but from where he sits behind the steering wheel; he really has no clue where he has to go or why he was given it at all! He does not know his destination or the path to take to it! What will he do? He may be blinded for some time by the marvel of the technology under his hands, thus he will indulge himself for as long as he can, and for as long as there is fuel in the tank, he'll just drive away! He'll just have fun! But what is he really doing? In reality, this is nothing but child's play! He's wasting fuel! He's wasting time! He's actually losing!

Now to be given something – that you obviously did not obtain on your own - and claim that it's up to you to decide what you should be doing with it, is a clear assault on whoever it was that gave it to you! Now imagine the magnitude of the insult when you actually claim that nobody gave you anything at all to begin with! Can you claim that you chose to come to this world out of your own free will, and that you chose to be born? Did you have any choice at all on whether or not to come to this world, enjoy those senses and powers, make the choices you are enabled to make, and gain whatever you have gained? You didn't! And when it's time for you to leave, do you have any choice about it? Can you not die? And when you're gone to wherever you will go to, can you come back?

Now I will not ask you in this context, what Darwin has to say in answer to this fundamental "WHY" question, because clearly he has nothing to say about it! Despite the feverish efforts by Dawkins and others to make the Darwinian faith appear as though it gives satisfactory answers to those

questions; it clearly does not! To make man appreciate his life and feel that he's "lucky" to be here – which is what they say it does to you! - is not something that needs Natural selection to make people feel it; it kills the value of those marvelous givens that we have, and mutes the deep natural urge in a man's soul to be thankful to their giver; the giver of those valueless and countless gifts! It mutilates a man's spirituality and intuition! So how can it possibly offer any reasonable answers to "Why" we are here?

I can easily argue that this is absolutely **not** what Darwin himself attempted to answer or even had on mind when he wrote his book on the origin of species and natural selection! This is because the theory clearly leaves the question itself pointless and meaningless! It leaves it hollow; and turns it actually – against every bit of reason and commonsense in man - into a mere product of organic evolution! It destroys the meaning of "purpose" along with many other basic meanings to human reason and intuition! To a Darwinian, we are merely a species that has evolved to a point where it started to make up "pointless" questions, perhaps as some sort of mental luxury or so! So what Darwinism teaches in this respect is in fact total abolish!

Anyway, I shall rebound to those meanings later… the point here is that a wise creator is one who creates everything for a reason and a purpose! Nothing in his creation is more than it should be, or less than it should be! Nothing is made for no purpose! Nothing is in its wrong place! Every fruit and every poison, every disease and evil that we see around us is made for a purpose, the knowledge of which is only to be obtained from Him, the maker!

Thus, reasonably enough, the All-wise creator must have limited our abilities to no more than what we need for the particular purpose of our creation in this world! And to accept the existence of a wise creator is to accept – naturally – the fact that He did not create anything without limits that accord with a particular purpose that only He defines!

The wise creator naturally did not create us to share power with Him! He did not create us to become His equals, His rivals, to become "gods" or to obtain

the power to challenge Him on the dominion of the universe! This is simple common sense here! It is a rational necessity of wisdom that is attributed to every king, every Lord, creator and owner of a created system! He will not let it be spoilt by the rebellion of one of its autonomous elements! It is a rationally necessary feature of the system even for the sake of the system itself! Power, dominion and control **over** it cannot be up to any element **within** it, neither can it be **shared with such an element**! You cannot imagine a ship with two captains, and two control panels; can you?! So what do you say of control over the entire Universe? Those are rational basics here; they are the foundations of Islamic faith in the Lord the creator, as argued effectively in the Qur'an! He will not enable us to destroy the entire universe; He will not allow us to challenge Him on His dominion above the heavens and Earth! Yes He did enable us to have choice and a manipulative form of control over a huge variety of resources in it, for the purpose for which we were created, **but only under natural physical restriction to those laws, limits and restrains that restrict all creatures and systems in the universe are we given this dominion of choice; not above them**!

To sum it up, think of this question: If reason cannot allow for the attributes of the creator of all creation to submit to any form of analogy that the human mind can afford, or to be testable in the labs of natural sciences the way created things (elements of the created system) are; then by what logic could we view this very rational necessity as a "problem" that keeps a scientist from admitting and accepting the necessary existence of the creator? This is sheer contradiction! It is no more than an empty pathetic attempt to create a problem out of something that is actually a natural given of human reason; just to support the position of atheism!

So easily would an atheist say in sheer arrogance: "I don't like the idea of the creator because it leaves me incapable of testing and examining the "nature" of that creator himself"! It's like saying: *"My condition for accepting the existence of anything that I cannot currently see; is that you prove to me that one day I will be capable of putting it under my microscope, or that the way it works is not out of reach of my human tool of perception, analogy and comprehension!"*

Well, as a matter of fact; **You** are the one who has to prove that everything in **existence** (not just in the universe) **has** to be fully comprehensible to man and analogous to things that he can perceive, qualify and quantify! Can you do that?

Is this – in its very nature – not a blind tenet of faith (one that is fundamental to Darwinism)? To *believe* that there is no limit whatsoever – in principle - to the human mind and the human perception, and that there cannot exist anything inside the universe or outside that is immeasurable, unperceivable, or incomprehensible? Yes indeed! It is by all means a tenet of blind faith; one that comes in conflict even with basic reason and with mathematics itself!

Now I ask of every reasonable man to tell me; what kind of "anti-science" and "anti-knowledge" is such a "faith"?! You'd rather deny the undeniable, twist and manipulate reason and commonsense, and make a man falsify his very own senses, just because you don't like the idea of not being capable of "explaining" the way the creator is, or the way He does what He does?

Indeed, blind arrogance only begets more blindness and more arrogance!

As you proceed with reading "The Delusion" you cannot help wondering, what does this man really think? He thinks that repeating the appraisal of natural selection over and over again will perhaps hypnotize the reader and eventually change his mind?

> *"Natural selection is a real solution. It is the only workable solution that has ever been suggested. And it is not only a workable solution, it is a solution of stunning elegance and power." (Delusion p. 121)*

No comment!

> *"What is it that makes natural selection succeed as a solution to the problem of improbability, where chance and design both fail at the starting gate? The answer is that natural selection is a cumulative process, which breaks the problem of improbability up into small pieces. Each of the small pieces is slightly improbable, but not prohibitively so. When large numbers of these slightly improbable*

> *events are stacked up in series, the end product of the accumulation is very very improbable indeed, improbable enough to be far beyond the reach of chance"* (Delusion p. 121)

Well, as we have demonstrated, the "accumulation" concept that he reveres so much about "Natural selection" is – in itself – a proof for its fallacy! We have argued effectively against this (slight improbability) that he attributes to those "steps of chance" that constitute his (mount improbable)! We have demonstrated linguistic inconsistencies like the one we find in this very statement! To accumulate, as a meaning, is to imply – by necessity – the existence of two things:

- An accumulator
- A container for accumulation
- A law that defines this process and guarantees its continuity!

Natural selection seeks to call itself a process – and it has no choice but to do – despite its emphatic denial of every rational aspect that the very word "process" itself must imply! An accumulation, that is, but without the basic dimensions of reason that do give the word "accumulate" its very meaning! Just like "designiod"; this indeed might be "accumuloid" so to speak! Just make sure to insert an "oid" suffix in every word of this sort as you speak, and you will be okay! Natural selection will – then – be your salvation!

Again, a set of billions of "lucky" chances that were all good enough to "add up" and to "accumulate" giving out this amazingly perfect end result, is to him far more "probable" than a single event of chance, not to mention a masterful act of creation! And of course, while a single event of chance is to him unthinkable; an accumulation of billions of happy events of "chance" that all come to fall in place before it's too late and "save the day", is on the contrary; **not** – in its totality - chance or random or improbable at all!

I remind the reader here that I'm applying his own use of chance, random and probability (the one that rips it off from its relative meaning; relative to man, and ascribes it to nature itself) and that I shall be doing so for the rest of this literature for the sake of the argument.

So; Chance + chance + chance + chance + …… = NOT CHANCE!

That is, atheists believe that given enough time: 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + … = 1

Well indeed yes; it is not "chance"! This must indeed prove that none of it could be "chance" at all! Yet, they insist on emptying the only right words to describe the way nature really works from their very meanings, applying the "-oid" word play! Say "Design" "designed" and so forth, - as you obviously have no choice but to do so - but make sure you keep in mind that they are not actually designs; but only appear as though they are! Do not be troubled by the fact that there are no words in any human language for the alternative meanings that Darwinians seek to express here (like a middle meaning between created and uncreated), and rest assured that with time and sufficient practice you will get used to them!

Moreover I have to wonder here: By what datum of reference or statistical inference could you decide that those "small pieces" are all just "slightly improbable", not to mention the **way they accumulated**?! Not a single one of the millions of steps of the Darwinian story is to be called "slightly improbable"! Not only because improbability – in concept - does not apply to changes the likes of which we never even saw before, but because the conditions and parameters by which those "random" mutations are supposed to emerge in every time they work, cannot possibly take place without an external organizer, a perfect creator (It's rationally impossible), and if I'm going to abide with their rationale of probability for the sake of the argument; I'll say it has to be unbelievably improbable that this would happen at all! So how do you describe billions of extremely improbable acts taking place **gradually** over an unbelievably long span of time despite the extremely high probability of all forms of destructive hazards and devastative events along the way; by any word other than Plan or **Design**? There can be no room for any other meaning at any level in this scenario, even as preposterous as it really is!

I could actually present dozens of other arguments the least of which is enough to destroy this nonsense at foundation level; however, I think I've already done that! I actually have much more valuable things to do with my

time than go on unraveling more defects in the rationale of “Natural selection”! So let’s get done with this book, or we never will!

> *“The creationist completely misses the point, because he (women should for once not mind being excluded by the pronoun) insists on treating the genesis of statistical improbability as a single, one-off event.” (Delusion p.121)*

I chose to quote this insignificant statement here just to show the reader how disturbed and extremely uneasy a writer will find himself, when he puts in his mind that the masculine pronoun he uses naturally when speaking of an unspecified gender is insufficient, or that he always has to make it (he/she) and (Him/her) and so forth instead of just (he) and (him) in any general statement that he makes![25] Well, I’m sorry to disappoint you professor, but wise, healthy women who have not been brainwashed by the nonsense of feminism and similar philosophies, will not feel even remotely offended by the common ways of human language in addressing people, if that’s what you think they will feel! The problem, professor, is in **your** own convictions, your personal beliefs; not in the way mankind has always been putting meanings into words!

This is what Darwinism does to a man! *(Or should I say: To a ‘human’, lest I be accused of sexism?!)*

Now listen to this:

> *“Evolution, by contrast, goes around the back of the mountain and creeps up the gentle slope to the summit: easy!”* (Delusion p.121)

Oh no! Not easy at all! It “Goes” and “creeps”, means it commits to a path (which is the slope itself)! I ask: Where did that slope itself come from in the

[25] It is really disappointing that many academic circles of the world today have come to *mandate* the use of so-called (gender-neutral) tactics in research writing and documentation instead of the masculine pronoun, as though a word like (mankind) has always been gender biased and exclusive to women, yet people never realized this (inequity) until lately! In fact many feminist authors in human sciences no longer use masculine pronouns at all, when referring to a human being in general! Some of them may discuss a certain issue concerning the human psyche with no particular emphasis on males or females, and while a reader may start reading about a (he), suddenly he finds himself reading about a (she), just for the sake of gender equity!!! Now as confusing as this trend may be to a reader, it has – unfortunately - become quite common indeed!

first place? First there has to be a slope to begin with and a driving power – constantly existent – to force the process up that slope, right? “Chance” and “easy” you say? Marvel as you wish with this “slope” of Darwinism professor, and praise Darwin for as much as you wish; every sane man with an ounce of truthfulness to himself and to his mind can easily see through it, and will indeed understand the real reason why it took “so long” for an idea “that simple” to be turned into “science” by a man like Darwin! No wonder here for them!

As I proceed, I find the author making a metaphor that is really not worthy of a comment, but I will quote it anyway!

> *“Another favourite metaphor for extreme improbability is the combination lock on a bank vault. Theoretically, a bank robber could get lucky and hit upon the right combination of numbers by chance. In practice, the bank's combination lock is designed with enough improbability to make this tantamount to impossible - almost as unlikely as Fred Hoyle's Boeing 747.” (Delusion p.122)*

First of all; we can easily see that no matter what he does, he cannot escape selecting a well **designed** object for his metaphor (the Bank combination lock). Now, please note that this is how he will always start it off.

Of course he forgets the basic question of “who designed the lock itself, and defined its combination code”! And while probabilistic reasoning works perfectly well describing how the bank lock works; it has nothing to do with the subject matter. Anyway, he then works his way – against all commonsense - in attempt to paint a pathetic image of a key that could work partially in the job of opening this lock, step by step! Thus he finds he has no choice but to get around by making an assumption that really has nothing to do with what any actual lock does, not to mention the Bank lock by which he began his metaphor! He says:

> *“But imagine a badly designed combination lock that gave out little hints progressively the equivalent of the 'getting warmer' of children playing Hunt the Slipper. Suppose that when each one of the dials approaches its correct setting, the vault door opens another chink,*

> *and a dribble of money trickles out. The burglar would home in on the jackpot in no time." (Delusion p.122)*

So where did the "extreme improbability" of opening a Bank lock by chance go; now that we have turned to talk about a "badly designed combination lock that gives out hints … etc."? How do we add up the last part to the first part of the metaphor?

There is **no** such lock (one that opens partially letting dribbles of money dribble out in such a way)! No money is coming out **at all** unless the lock is open or broken! And then again, whoever keeps attempting to open it gradually and to go through it; cannot by any means be doing this without a previous intent and a long lasting – very long indeed - will and determination! We do **not** have that in natural selection! Or do we?

Even as pathetic as this imaginary lock would be, it would demand a specific design that opens up gradually in this manner! So no matter what he does, he can't pull it off!

Now look at this statement of religious praise:

> *"Darwin devoted an entire chapter of the Origin of Species to 'Difficulties on the theory of descent with modification', and it is fair to say that this brief chapter anticipated and disposed of every single one of the alleged difficulties that have since been proposed, right up to the present day." (Delusion p.123)*

Well, I suppose atheists are bound now to praise the name of Darwin, the "prophet" of modern day atheism! Not a single "alleged" difficulty to natural selection that ever came to arise ever since the time he wrote down his "revelations", did he leave unanswered in his perfect book "the origin of species"; and only in a brief chapter! Isn't this a miracle?

I know that many readers will say that my comment here is not "scientific"; but then, by what standards of any practice of natural sciences whatsoever is this statement by Dawkins here to be called "scientific"? We're obviously not talking science now! It is clearly the way a stout believer (a preacher no

less) speaks of his book of faith and of the "teachings" of his prophet in certainty and devotion!

Do you, professor, claim Darwin to be an infallible prophet who delivers teachings to mankind from an omniscient being (as it is the case with followers of every religion)?

You'd say you don't!

Is this work by Darwin in reality anything more than a manmade theory that may be subject to revision, objection, modification, and maybe even total replacement?

You'd force yourself to admit that it isn't!

So how – on earth - can any natural scientist allow himself to make such a **bold** claim about a theory of natural sciences unless he really holds it for an unquestionable doctrine of faith, and truly believes it to be infallible? "Every single one of the *alleged* difficulties" he says! Is this even possible for any man to write a theory that suffers not even a single difficulty whatsoever, no matter how minor? What is it – then – that evolutionists have been doing – revising and manipulating – with Darwin's theory ever since it came out to this day? I suppose they are committing some form of a *heresy* or *blasphemy* against Darwin! How do they even dare drift or sway from the original teachings of the Apostle of natural selection?

As for me, a Muslim, I can so easily prove that **my prophet is a messenger from the Lord creator of heaven and earth, and thus that there is not a single objection or difficulty that has ever been raised against his message that does not have a profoundly complete, rational and consistent answer**!

Such a powerful and bold claim indeed, isn't it?! Yes it is! And I'm willing to go with it to the end of the Earth, and discuss my evidence with any man alive, no matter what background of faith he comes from! This is my faith! And I know it to be true both from general and tons of detailed evidence! My position of knowledge here is a position of faith! The only perfectly justifiable faith in the only perfect and infallible source of knowledge! It is

not a position of scientific **skepticism** that is reasonably assumed by a natural scientist who is still questioning the theories of his colleagues and who will never be certain about the completeness of human theorization (which will never be complete; hence he will never quit being skeptic about it and unsatisfied with it, no matter how far it goes)! I know out of certainty – not skepticism – that Darwin was wrong! I believe him to be wrong, and it's not a blind faith! Faith is by definition a position of certainty! It is the exact antonym of skepticism! So if this faith is founded on an evidently true knowledge, justified by irrefutable evidence, then any theory of science that comes to contradict it is simply (and verifiably): **False**!

So when I make such a confident statement about the teachings of the prophet I follow, I'm not ascribing perfectness and infallibility to the hypothesis of an ordinary man like myself where healthy skepticism is the proper and reasonable position to take! I'm ascribing it to a body of knowledge that is verifiably the Lord's revelation.

But is this the position of the professor here?

Far from it!

While he is supposed to assume the position of a skeptic natural scientist (a biologist), not of a minister of religion; hints of his true position as a strong believer and even "a preacher of faith" – like the previously quoted statement of his - keep popping up every now and then, and he cannot help it! It does not surprise me though, not a single bit!

He is indeed a preacher of a religion that propagates itself in a cloak of natural sciences! His temple is in his lab and his congregation is in his lecture hall; and he's out to convert you all!

He then proceeds to discuss the so called "theory of irreducible complexity".

I quote:

> *"A functioning unit is said to be irreducibly complex if the removal of one of its parts causes the whole to cease functioning." (Delusion p.123)*

Now there is much to say here in discussion of nothing more than this mere definition alone! The notion of "irreducibility" is indeed a philosophical statement of a rationally sound meaning that flows quite naturally from the very meaning of the word (closed system) which is the best word to describe a living organism with every biological process that runs in its body! And even though it makes perfect sense as we will discuss, atheists hate it and fight it with all their power because it seeks to replace Darwinism as a philosophy of Biology!

Now it sounds so easy to judge a complex system, doesn't it? A part that does not seem to have a known purpose to me - and thus appears to be *removable* – is proof that this system was not properly designed, or that it did not have a good designer! So what is it that may allow me to make this judgment on a given system X?

There is a set of conditions of knowledge that should be fulfilled in me (the observer or the critic) before I can make such a judgment on a "part" of any given –perfectly or imperfectly functioning - system! Conditions of qualification! I can easily do that – as a man - with a car, or a hand watch or any manmade artifact, if and only if:

- I can easily obtain its blueprints,
- I fully understand its function and the detailed purpose of its making, by knowledge that comes only from its maker,
- And I have all the knowledge it takes to design a similar artifact on my own.

Now, without the fulfillment of a single one of these conditions; by what right could I allow myself to criticize this artifact, pick out one of its parts and claim that it has no function, or that the system could do without it?

What would you say of a man who knows little about the way a computer is built, and yet he opens it up, pulls out some expansion card or a RAM chipset and throws it away, and when he turns it on and finds that it still boots properly, he concludes that this part that he removed arbitrarily must have had no function, and from there deduce that it was badly designed (not

to mention that it was not designed at all)? In his ignorance, this fool made a judgment that is by all means false and presumptuous, and thought that he has proven that the computer is badly designed! He thinks this is proof that as a designed system, this device is **reducible**!

Fact of the matter is that he did **not** know what that thing he removed really was! He did not know what it was there for! He thus had no idea what kind of damage he really caused! So whatever can he possibly prove when he sees – in his limited knowledge – that his removal of that part seemingly did not affect the way the machine functions? He is not qualified to make such a judgment in the first place!

As a matter of fact, had the professor been actually talking in the previous quotation about a manmade artifact I would've said to him: the fact that it does not cease to work even after the removal of this part does not prove the part to be functionless, just like in the example I just made on a computer device! But in fact, he is talking about **organic** systems; **biological** systems, systems that are far too complex to identify at any level of certainty what exactly every subsystem within them is there for! Systems about which we lack the conditions of knowledge that I mentioned a few paragraphs earlier; all three of them!

- We do not have the systems blueprints!
- We do not – and cannot - fully understand the functions of all of its parts and the purpose of their making
- And we certainly do not have the knowledge to create a similar one!

The idea of reducibility – by which they oppose "IC" - stems from the same arrogant atheistic approach to every system or order in nature! Even the term "organ" can only have a relative meaning that is only defined by means of human observation and conclusion of what we currently think is the particular role that this part plays in this overwhelmingly complex system! Does this mean that what we know now about the function of every part that we identify as an organ; is by necessity all there is to it, and there's no other set of functions of which this set of cells is subsystem? No! It doesn't! A

wise man of science should know that it doesn't! Scientists are discovering more and more and learning more every day, about the way organs function! So what today you claim to be "replaceable" or "reducible" due to your current lack of knowledge may easily prove to be otherwise tomorrow! This has been the trend of human knowledge ever since the dawn of mankind: we grow – by accumulation of knowledge with time - to learn more about this amazingly seamless system that we call nature! So it should be taken for a law of philosophy to be hung on the office-wall of every biologist, **that there is no such a thing as a reducible system in biology**! We simply cannot afford to make such a judgment, no matter how much knowledge we may possess of any given biological system!

> *"A cataract patient with the lens of her eye surgically removed can't see clear images without glasses, but can see enough not to bump into a tree or fall over a cliff." (Delusion p.123)*

Now that's a clear example of the meaning I'm talking about here! This example is supposed to lead you to the conclusion that the human eye is a reducible system!

The problem is; the author here is not kidding! In a different context I would really take this for a joke! But he's really **not** kidding!

A cataract patient is somebody who suffers a **sickness** that spoils the way her eye works! It does not blacken the eyesight or cause blindness; but it seriously damages eyesight! So yes she can still see enough not to bump into a tree or fall off a cliff; but who – on earth – could dare claim that humans can do in this life with an eye that only sees that much? I mean not as an individual, but as a species, as a kind, the kind of man as a whole; by what right or reason can a sane man claim that an eye without a lens could suffice or could make us into a species to begin with? The use of the eye in man is not just to dodge a tree or to not fall off a cliff! The professor knows that much, I hope!

So when we say "what good is half an eye" we mean what good is it for the job – every possible function - the eye is supposed to do in this particular species! Everything that it does is part of its job! Everything we – the

humans – can see is part of what our eyes are made this way to do! So what they don't realize is that by reducing the structure of the organ in such a way, they are – by necessity - reducing its functionality as well! The system would then serve only a part of its purpose; and the bigger the damage (or the reduction), the bigger the failure! Because its purpose is not defined by one or two functions that it does, but by **everything** that a human eye works for, and should reasonably justify its distinction in structure and composition from the eyes of other species! So I will agree – in principle - that an eye without a lens could do for humans, only if you could convince me, professor, that all that you need your own eyes for is to avoid falling off a cliff or bumping into a tree! Isn't it sad that we may have to respond to such a statement?

"Seeing" is something that works for a variety of purposes in the life of an animal, not to mention man! Not to bump into a tree is indeed the simplest imaginable purpose of them all and in fact the least that should come to our concern! What about identifying a prey and hunting it? What about identifying a predator and escaping it? What about identifying the female for mating? What about guarding the territory and protecting it? What about feeding the young and protecting them? What about man and his extremely sophisticated use of his eyes – as well as the rest of his senses - which makes him what he is on this Earth? Are those not all basic necessary "functions" and "purposes" of the eye?

Those people are after nothing but the attempt to insert hideous imperfection in the system, the very system they cannot resist – in other occasions - admitting its magnificence and perfectness! The very system the perfection of which gives them their jobs and the definition of their missions as scientists!

Look at the way he goes on with this:

> *"Half a wing is indeed not as good as a whole wing, but it is certainly better than no wing at all."* (*Delusion p.123*)

Absolutely not! You first have to answer to this: **better for what** exactly? If the purpose we are talking about is flying and navigating through the air like

birds do (which is very obviously necessary for *them* as a species), then certainly half a wing is not doing this! It is not the key for **that** lock! If all that an organism needs here is like he says, an organ to: *"save your life by easing your fall from a tree of a certain height.",* then clearly this is not the job of what we would call a **wing**, is it?! It is the job of something else! There are indeed certain species today (like the squirrel glider) that do have such a "web" of loose skin that would help them glide in the air with ease when they jump from one tree to another at great heights or to the ground! But this is by no means to be called a **wing**! **It is another organ doing another function in another species**!

> *"And 51 per cent of a wing could save you if you fall from a slightly taller tree. Whatever fraction of a wing you have, there is a fall from which it will save your life where a slightly smaller winglet would not." (Delusion p.123)*

What a miserable image indeed! This is dead wrong, because the wing is clearly a tool that works entirely differently from this so called "winglet"! If the purpose of a wing was originally to keep an animal from getting damaged when it falls off a tree (of course one has to wonder how it got up the tree in the first place!), then it never should've had the ability to fly off at all, and develop into what we now know as wings! It didn't need it! In fact one would expect the final step of evolution of such a device, the function of which is only to save a falling animal, to end up more like a parachute with more skin (a wider area) to achieve higher air resistance during the fall! But to turn into a pair of wings with the power to navigate and move up in the air; what on earth could justify this eccentric shift? Nothing at all! Only the blindness of a Darwinian who insists on placing those two distinct and equally perfect devices as they are –each in keeping up with its distinct job – on a single track in his mythical story of natural history!

He proceeds:

> *"By analogy with the trees of different height, it is easy to imagine situations in which half an eye would save the life of an animal where 49 percent of an eye would not."* (Delusion p.124)

As a matter of fact, it is wrong to say that "saving the life of an animal" is the only function even of those pieces of skin in glider squirrels that he views to be "less evolved" than wings! (How that skin could "evolve" into feathers to become 'wings' is another thing that is beyond me!)! Their job is actually to help them jump from one tree trunk to another by means of smooth air gliding! They use it for the purpose of moving from one place to another for short distances, not as a safety device just in case they were to drop off the tree! The author, just like all other Darwinians, forgets that first he has to **prove** that there once was a species that was endangered due to its inability to maintain balance above high trees, which to his notion justifies the "evolution" of wings! I say, no animal that finds itself incapable of climbing a tree; would even dare climb one in the first place! To shift its metabolic system into feeding from down on the ground where it is safe is clearly a much easier and more 'probable' option for evolution of such a species, isn't it?! And again, clearly enough, this "safety" function is not what those gliders use their equipment for!

Now far more corrupt in terms of reasoning is to claim that the eye's job is to "save an animal's life" according to his proposed analogy here! Try to bring a few animals of any species that has eyes, damage their eyes down to half of their eyesight, and see for yourself what would be of them in the wilderness!

You see my reader, the problem is clearly with the way they so arrogantly take their irrational faith to the level of an unquestionable fact; and from there, they just go on taking every morphologically proximal species that seem to have an apparently "less complex" structure than species X, to be an example of what the ancestor of X was like before it "evolved" into X, and by that they go on to acquire what they call "*piles of overwhelming evidence*"! Had it not been for their blind unrelenting denial of there being a creator who made it all in whatever way He chose, and gave every species exactly what it needed, they would've admitted the deep corruption of their ways!

According to this reasoning, they would give themselves the right to describe certain forms of life as "evolved" and others as "less evolved" or

even “primitive”, on the grounds that there are parts in certain organisms that they claim do more of a certain function than similar parts in other organisms! However, looking close enough you would easily see that neither are the parts equal, nor are the functions they do! Gliding between two trees like a kite or a parachute, is clearly not the same as, and not even close to flying overseas like an airbus! One needs only to have a good pair of eyes and a proper sense of things to see this! There is no privilege in a bird’s wing over a glider’s skin coat! The glider does not need to fly the way a bird does, neither does a bird only need to glide between tall trees! Both kinds have survived perfectly just the way they are! Those are two clearly distinct forms of life with clearly distinct feeding habits and life styles! So by what right do they allow themselves to put a glider at a lower level of evolution – biologically – below birds?

Here’s an expression of the logical incoherence of this reasoning! They judge the function of an organ (X) in species (A), by the standards of the function of an organ (Y) in species (B), on the false assumption that (Y) should better be doing in (B) the same function that (X) is doing in (A)! This is absolutely false, because (B) is observed to survive perfectly well with (Y) not with (X), and (A) survives perfectly well with (X) not with (Y)! So there’s nothing to even suggest an evolutionary history here!

What we have is two distinct systems of navigation in the air: short distance gliding or parachuting, and long distance flying and navigating! Each of the two systems has its own standards of functionality, and is seen to work perfectly for the species that uses them, with organs that are perfectly functional just the way they are!

Thus we say that when the author here attempts to use this example to prove that the system of “flying” in birds is reducible, he is really building falsity upon a deeper falsity! And unless he could prove to us that once upon a time a certain species of gliders needed to have wings instead of skin flaps (a totally different organ) and fly away, we have no reason whatsoever to accept such a claim! And clearly enough now, no wing could do its job in flying the way it should – or any other relevant function - if it had one or some of its parts reduced or removed! Go ahead and try it yourself! Grab a

pigeon – for example – and cut off half of its wings, then place it over a tree branch, kick it from there to see it fall, and see what it will do! It most certainly will not glide! So what part of a wing – any given wing of any given species – do they think could be reduced without that species failing – as a result - to fly or to glide? And whoever could claim that as a species it could survive without that part?

Do not mix a glider with a bird! Reduce any part you choose of the device of gliding or of the device of flying, as they are, and see what happens to them!

Failure, on one level or another, if not total failure! That's what will happen!

To reduce an organ is to – quite simply – leave it insufficient in performing its particular function! And we never saw any species suffering from such insufficiency in our long experience with observing elements of natural life! All we see is perfect organs – in the normal case that defines the species– in all species everywhere doing exactly what they are supposed to do!

Darwinians – however - are trying to convince us that since a corrupted organ (reduced) may not be too corrupt to fail entirely, and may still have some use left in it at a certain level, that those parts you took away from it are "reducible" or are not necessary for the organ to work the way it should work! Just what are they talking about? Who defines "the way it should work" in the first place and by whose standards?

Whenever a wise man speaks of a function or a purpose for a particular device, he starts by acquiring all knowledge there is to acquire about the device, and by defining its desired function clearly (by authority of its designer who made it this way), before he judges the way that this device fulfills it! However it is obvious why atheists never take this approach! It is purely a question of belief! They give themselves – because of that belief – the authority to reduce complex systems they are barely starting to understand! But this surprises me not! I mean, they did admit the inversion of human intuition to be an essential condition for people's consciousness to be *raised* "high" enough for them to accept Darwinism, didn't they?

> *"Smooth gradients are provided by variations in lighting conditions, variations in the distance at which you catch sight of your prey - or your predators." (Delusion p.124)*

Great! However, those variations that you may see exist today varying among different species, are all perfectly fit each in its particular species just as it is! We have never seen any one of those species suffering from insufficient eyesight, and thus having to survive long enough – despite this failure - until a lucky mutation comes along to give it a more efficient eye, if it ever does! Each one of those species is equipped with nothing more or less than it needs! Now try to alter or shift any of these variables in any given species one slight level up or down and see what damage you will do! If I could not see a predator early enough for me to manage my escape or my camouflage, then I'm doomed! I will never live long enough to breed and become a species in the first place, with such a predator always stalking me! There is no possibility for a lesser organ for this particular species living under those particular conditions! This fact is really too clear to demand proof!

So when the professor says:

> *"And, as with wings and flight surfaces, plausible intermediates are not only easy to imagine: they are abundant all around the animal kingdom." (Delusion p.124)*

This clearly demonstrates the sheer emptiness of their reasoning! It's only amazing how some of them insist that they cannot see the magnitude of the leap of faith that is required to accept this pathetic story of 'evolution' they chose to believe in!

The mere proximity in physical features and general biological functions between different species does not make them hereditarily related professor, and it certainly does not prove them to have all descended from one common ancestor! It is you who **need** to believe that they are! Driven by faith and faith alone, Darwinians forged all kinds of theoretical explanations for spatial relations and proximal similitude between carefully selected observations and findings (and I use the word selected deliberately here) to

build this huge (tree of evolution) the way they did, and turn it into indisputable fact, not troubled for a minute by the sheer logical and linguistic incoherence and fallacy at the very foundations of Darwin's theory!

It is quite obvious that a number of species that live under the same conditions, submit to the same laws of the physical world, and are all parts of the same continuous cycles of nature (both animate and inanimate cycles: food chains, water cycles, etc.); will certainly have to share a great deal of similar features, and sometimes even strikingly similar organic compositions (in DNA as well as in morphology)! Their variety – as unbelievably wealthy as it is – is limited by the unity of the natural conditions to which they are all restricted! (That's why I call them morphologically proximal)! An amphibian animal – for example - is by necessity expected to be an **intermediate** – in the way it was created (its physiological structure and its body functions) – between a marine animal and a reptile, and the closer it would be to a particular species in the locale and the general conditions of living, the more likely it is to look closer to it in those features that accord it to those conditions and adapt it to them! This is not a theory of biology; it is a simple observation! This biological similarity or proximity which places an amphibian in this place in biological terms, is not the way it is because there was some sort of "evolutionary" slope upon which they all moved gradually from one step to another, all starting by pure chance in a soup of proteins, or because there was some point in the history of natural life where some fishes had to *crawl* out of the sea and evolve into amphibians, but simply because any living being that lives both in the water and on the land is expected to already have the best qualities that allow it to live in such a way, and thus it will have to share certain biological features and organic qualities with both sea creatures and land creatures!

When Dawkins compares the eye of a flatworm to that of a man, trying to prove his point on "plausible intermediates", he almost makes me laugh, because quite clearly, the job and the purpose of a flatworm eye is much "less" than the purpose of a human eye! We certainly cannot do - as humans - with a flatworm eye… can we?! And on the other hand, had the flatworm needed any more complex eye structure for the sake of performance of its

different organic functions, and fitting in its place in nature; it would never have speciated as such, with an eye as such!

Now, let's try to move on with this part for it has taken much more than it should!

The worship of Gaps, you say?!

In this section, Dawkins flaunts over the comic book image of "god of the gaps" that he claims is an argument – or at least an intimidating objection - against all religion! We have discussed this meaning repeatedly in previous parts, and have clarified that though there is indeed a great deal of deities that have been (scientifically) proven false with the expanse of advancements in natural sciences, this is **not** the case with all religions all the same! He cannot prove that all religions suffer from this problem, no matter what he does! Yet the professor thinks that by joking around and making fun of some obviously corrupted texts in certain religious books; he would be making his point and justifying his position as an atheist!

He claims – first off – that religion – all religion – strangulates the quest for knowledge, on the grounds that whenever you don't know, you'd easily say: "God knows" and just quit searching! Now as much as this image appeals to atheists, it may only be the case with false religions that are not delivered from the omniscient, all-wise creator, or ones that have been corrupted and spoilt! Followers of the true revelation of the creator understand that the Lord knows it all, and controls it all, yet they also know that they are here for a purpose, that purpose is based upon knowledge; knowledge that places everything in its right place, and gives a man the only wise and right justification for what he does with his life, including the ways he takes in his quest and search for advancement and prosperity in natural sciences and in all fields of human knowledge all the same! So there's indeed a great difference between telling people not to advance in 'science', and telling them to let go of false or unethical paths that certain doctrines of faith (like atheism) have been driving natural sciences into!

A follower of the true heavenly wisdom is a man who knows exactly what he is here in this world to do! And thus, he knows when he walks into a lab, what exactly he is searching for and for what end; he holds that end or higher objective with reliable evidence that it is the truth from its only rightful and capable source, not the philosophy of another man like himself! So he does not waste his entire lifetime enslaved in his lab by the fallacious beliefs of another man! He knows that there are yet far more causes and laws that the Lord has created in this nature that we still do not know, and may have to search for and uncover by means of our human tools, for the sake of better fulfilling the purpose of our being on this earth! He's not doing science, posing questions just for the fun of it! A Muslim is certainly not afraid that as a believer, science may endanger his faith, or that as a scientist religion may leave him with nothing to do! Far from it!

And as a follower of the true heavenly revelation, he knows better indeed than waste time, money, and resources on a quest that is radically **false** or that bears no true benefit to mankind, on all levels! He knows much better!

Just listen to this quotation by Dawkins in which an atheist justifies his deep hate for all religion:

> *"Mystics exult in mystery and want it to stay mysterious. Scientists exult in mystery for a different reason: it gives them something to do." (Delusion p.126)*

How pathetic is a man who just keeps working and working – blindly - with a certain practice just because "*it gives him something to do*"! This is indeed, my respectable reader, the emptiness of a blind and ignorant heart! He knows not what he is here on this Earth to do! At the far end of it; he knows not the meaning or purpose of life itself! He knows not what he should keep running his labs and his research for; he just sees himself enjoying the *mystery* and the glory of uncovering the mystery, so blindly he hits the gas and runs away… where to, it doesn't matter! Why and what for, who cares? He's just doing it for the fun of it… Only to prove that he *can*! Just because it gives him "something to do"!

If this is what it's all about to you professor, then by all means go ahead, close your eyes and have fun!

No, my respectable reader, religion does not teach us the virtue of being satisfied with ignorance; it teaches us the exact opposite to that! It teaches the wisdom of knowing what queries to claim and for what end! It gives the process its higher **purpose**, its meaning and gives it its only right path! Wisdom – to those who know it - starts from the point of knowing **the right question** to ask, and the right query to take to the lab! It's atheists who are satisfied with their ignorance in this respect!

The author then complains about creationists. He must understand though that their arguments against evolutionism are **not** by necessity the way scholars of every other religion would argue, and when you prove that creationism is wrong in many of its ways or arguments you certainly don't prove 'religion' to be wrong! Now I will not be as naïve as he hopes, and declare – like creationists usually do - that since he cannot tell me how this evolved from that, or he cannot give me any "intermediate fossils", or "missing links", then "God did it" and hence it can only be "designed"! Instead, I would easily ravage his false reasoning at foundation level, as I've been doing so far in this literature! My argumentation in this book goes deep underneath all that "noise" to the level where every reasonable man should be arguing against atheism in general and Darwinism in particular! I am not in the least intimidated by the slander or the expel by some academic community here or there, that many people may fear, and thus find themselves forced to compromise and seek some 'middle grounds'! It was this intimidation that spawned pathetic positions in contemporary Christian thought like (Creationism) with its many different flavors: (old Earth, young Earth, Neo-creationism, progressive creationism …etc.)! I have no reservations whatsoever in hammering mainstream philosophy wherever it is, as long as I know how to forge my arguments and present my evidence clear as day!

> *"The following is hypothetical but entirely typical. A creationist speaking: 'The elbow joint of the lesser spotted weasel frog is irreducibly complex. No part of it would do any good at all until the*

> *whole was assembled. Bet you can't think of a way in which the weasel frog's elbow could have evolved by slow gradual degrees.' If the scientist fails to give an immediate and comprehensive answer, the creationist draws a default conclusion: 'Right then, the alternative theory, "intelligent design", wins by default.'"* (Delusion p.126)

I really pity this poor "creationist" here! He so easily fell in the trap! As for me, I don't need to do anything to prove that the weasel frog never "evolved" an elbow joint, at all! As we observe it in its locale, we can easily see that it couldn't possibly do without the joint there in the first place! It could've never become a species to begin with, if it didn't have one! Try removing that joint out from its elbow – or any part of it -, put the frog back in the lake and see for yourself! Now *that* would indeed be an *"interesting project for a graduate student"*, wouldn't it?!

The philosophical trick here is in the precise definition of the function (X) of the elbow joint in the Weasel frog! Now this particular job (X) cannot be done any better by any other biological system, and clearly enough, this kind of species, suited to this particular ecosystem as it is, cannot survive without that joint as it is in there! It thus follows – rationally – that there couldn't have possibly been a time when this kind of species – as a species – didn't have an organ that was good enough for job (X) that this organ is doing, otherwise it wouldn't have become a species at all! Unless of course it didn't need it back then, and it fitted perfectly well without it; which – in fact - makes it another species altogether, one that had no need for job (X), but for some other job (Y) that helped it survive with its own ecosystem! Now, this has nothing to do with creationism or reducible complexity or even biology folks; this is plain commonsense and elementary logic![26]

[26] It may be useful to add here that this clear distinction in definition of biological function between organs of fossilized species and current ones leaves the inference of ancestry baseless! The distinction between (X) and (Y) as functions should be rationally sufficient to draw the same distinction between (A) and (B) as species! It is no plausible argumentation to infer that (B) was ancestral to (A) on the grounds that – for example – we never dug out a fossil of a (A) from the geological stratum where we found (B)! Absence of knowledge is not knowledge of absence! Adaptation or even selective breeding – which are both facts known by observation - are not indicators of the possibility of such a relation between (A) and (B), because neither adaptation nor artificial selection – as we observe them – could possibly develop a

So I'm not even interested in whatever new fiction he may come up with, linking some living species to one another in such a warped way, placing them in another Darwinian ladder, attempting to use that for evidence to prove his position that there is no creator! This is all child-play to me, and a waste of precious time!

Creation is the only plausible answer around (to a question that shouldn't have ever come to be asked at all in the first place) and it will always be so, because it is the only rational mode of thinking for every sane, healthy human being! What Darwin really did was plot a theoretical, philosophical attempt to twist human reason to the point of accepting that there *could* be another alternative to creation! And now Dawkins is actually condemning those scientists who speak of "intelligent design" as an alternate to evolution! Isn't it a pity? To twist man's reason –as such - is to destroy the way he thinks and the way he sees things around him! Nothing is more worthy of being labeled as "bad science" or "pseudo-science", no matter how mainstream it has become!

This is why naturally, when we blow a Darwinian's arguments out of the water - with sound and solid rational arguments I must add - we are only putting things **back in their right place and restoring the right order of things in a man's mind**!

So it is supposed to be viewed as *silly* of him to complain and object that when *creationists* disprove evolution in any given particularity, they believe that by default they are proving creation! Well yes of course they're not! No healthy human being has to do anything at all to prove "creation"! It has always been **you** – the Darwinians – who bear the burden of proof, to prove to all mankind that their very own senses and their very own minds and tongues have always been fooling them! And if it may help bring some atheists back to their senses that we demonstrate in detail some of the clear rational incoherencies of Darwinian philosophy, then so be it! It has always

new organ to serve a new function (X) instead of a function (Y) in species (B), thus turning it into species (A)! We never saw that! It's amazing how they don't feel that they need to – at least – show us that this phenomenon did happen one day!

been the atheist's pathetic cause and struggle – exclusively so - to sway people's reason and twist it to have them accept this theory!

You speak of the political immunity of ID? Well, Fact of the matter is; no other theory in any branch of natural sciences in the documented history of mankind has ever enjoyed such a faithfully devoted cult of followers and even militant *apologists* in scientific academia like the theory of Darwin; despite the very clearly counter-intuitive and counter-rational tenets upon which it is founded!

And again I cannot miss the chance to express the sorrow I feel towards "creationists" who hang on to the argument of lack of fossil intermediates! By this, the poor guys are actually admitting to evolutionists that there is indeed a reasonable frame of arguable evidence within which they work as they examine their fossils, and that once they could come up with the "missing link" they would be granted philosophical approval as an evidently proven theory!

This is why many Christian scientists (creationists) would unfortunately fail the debate, and instead of disproving Darwinism, they usually find themselves trapped in it, solidifying its foundations; thus giving their opponents leverage on the outset of it, that only leaves them in need to make as much of a compromise as they can! And eventually you get many versions of Christianity where people haste to give any interpretation they see fit to any scripture that may appear to come in contrast with this or that theory! I say they do indeed lose the debate from the very moment they mention the word 'science' there!

Science is clearly not the arena of argumentation where this battle is to be fought! This is why they would only find themselves confused, trapped and strangled to death in a futile struggle among the many branches of this gigantic tree of theory, and naturally fail to address – or even see - its rotten roots deep down! The roots of its monumental irrationality! No wonder they leave their opponents making fun of what seems to be a relentless search on their part for some "gap" or "missing link" in the story to fit their god into! And no wonder they left a man like Dawkins with a final resolution of never

to debate a "creationist" again! I mean what on earth did they expect?! They slid down the same slippery slope with atheists, and found themselves following their very same pitiful lines of thought, ending up with the label of "pseudo-scientists", as though they were some little children trying to prove by means of fossil findings, archaeology, genetics and microbiology that Santa Clause created the universe billions of years ago from his castle up in the North Pole! This is how they made it look, when they effectively turned the undisputable fact of creation into an "ism"! By God, **What 'transitional fossils' are you people challenging them to present?** I mean what are you doing guys? **Just get out of there**!

May the Lord guide you all to the truth!

> *"We could easily have had no fossils at all, and still the evidence for evolution from other sources, such as molecular genetics and geographical distribution, would be overwhelmingly strong." (Delusion p.127)*

Clearly; the very same rational problem with the understanding of what "evidence" is! No matter how many more Darwinian interpretations of observable phenomena – in fossils or elsewhere - you may pile up to your theory, this doesn't fix the fundamental corruption in its rational basis!

And what does molecular biology do in favor of evolution anyway? It never demonstrated any process of ancestry with new organs emerging or the advent of any form of new genetic data that would significantly shift the set of functions a creature's organic makeup is perfectly set to perform! Geographical distribution does not prove common ancestry either! Darwinian ancestry and local speciation is merely a proposed explanation for it! **Geographical differences among species in all cases are only the natural outcome of thousands of years of adaptation and re-adaptation to distinct natural conditions!**

Actually I may argue that this persistent attitude of sheer stubbornness and blindness by worshippers of Darwin is indeed one of the major reasons why the Lord chose to do that! For the sake of the test of life, and for every arrogant heart that has seen the falsity of its methods and "explanations" and

yet would still insist on advocating fallacy nonetheless, and rejecting the truth as clear as it sees it; to really deserve the price it will one day pay for its arrogant choices!

When on that day they say: *"Oh Lord, why did you choose to create life the way you did, fooling us into believing that it all evolved from pure chance?"* Or *"Oh God why did you choose to cause some events in the world in ways that we do not understand and ask us to accept them as your creation?"!* What excuse would they have then? On what base of argument will they stand? You rejected what you could not explain claiming that you do that because you could not explain it (scientifically); when you know very well that this doesn't make it a fallacy, and that this is not the true reason you rejected it! You insisted on denying the perfectly clear mastery of creation of this world, on the basis of an idea that is so obviously false, made by a heart like your own, so what excuse do you think you may have? With the sheer corruption of their methods clarified and the irrationality of their claims exposed before them, here and now on Earth, what excuse would they really have there? Well, when a man chooses willingly to reject the clearest of rational necessities, and insists on calling his own synthetic fallacies evidence; he **does** indeed deserve to be fooled, for it is he who did that to himself, and it is then a perfectly just and fair reason for the Lord to create certain creatures in a certain way for atheists to fool themselves into believing them to share ancestry or to have "evolved" the way they claim they did, with no "creation" whatsoever!

Fair enough indeed!

Choice in this life is responsibility; a responsibility of an eternal fate no less!

They insist on denying the undeniable, taking solace in false reasoning and a fundamentally false application of the scientific method!

I see a wide hole in the ground, how do I explain it? I may propose it to be due to the work of a man, the explosion of a bomb, the bombardment of some meteorite, or some natural seismic activity or the motion of Earth strata above one another! I may add a few more possible explanations – according to my limited understanding and experience with similar causes to

similar effects (analogy) – to the sample space of probability there. Then with closer examination I may pick the most probable analogy from within that space (that set of possibilities I have proposed), make it "the" explanation, and go from there to explain all the details of the event. It would be by all means plausible science!

The question now is this: what if there is – for example – some ample rational argument that proves that it was actually impossible for any man to have ever placed a bomb in this place? Shouldn't it be enough to blow this line of probabilities off the sample space entirely? And what if we could actually prove - with rationally indisputable argumentation - that the hole cannot have been caused by something that we could submit to analogy in the first place, and that it is by necessity the remainder of an event that has to be like nothing we ever saw or could even imagine? Would there still be any sample space of probability to tinker with? Would this 'gathering and piling up of forensic evidence', then, make any sense at all?

You'd think that such a fundamental rule of rationality concerning the function and value of "evidence" is too clear to demand explanation or demonstration! However, with a mind entrenched in Darwinism; nothing is clear enough!

So we have to spell it out, over and over again.

Atheists would often complain that "people of religion" do not accept those forms of evidence (tons and tons of overwhelming evidence) in Biology because of their faith in their gods and religions, even though they would accept much lesser forms of evidence in many other fields of natural science! Well yes of course they would reject any such "evidence" that seeks to make them believe that by their nature, humans are incapable of telling their left from their right, and that's why they view the world to be "created" when in fact it's not! **Yes of course science grants acceptance sometimes to much lower ranks of evidence than this huge forensic accumulation that we have here; but whenever a scientist seeks to pile such kind of "evidence" in any field of natural sciences for the sake of validating a**

theory that violates a standard axiom of human reason, language and rational necessities; it is by all means bad science! [27]

I repeat that it is not the ways of empirical or forensic science that I reject here! It's the Darwinian application of those particular ways for the sake of this corrupt philosophy they insist to believe in! It is the philosophical platform upon which this "science" stands that I am rejecting and arguing against! Because it is from that platform that their ranking and evaluation of "evidence" itself emerges; and that's where they have the problem! This is why we say no matter how many "tons" of "evidence" you pile up people; it accounts for nothing! **This rank of evidence simply cannot validate an argument for an idea as philosophically corrupt as 'natural selection', not to mention an argument against (creation), no matter how big the pile grows!** Imagine dropping coins, one coin after another, in a money jar that has no bottom! This is what those thousands of findings (from many disciplines of science) really account for! They just fall straight from the bottom of the jar!

Some atheists would draw the analogy of Evolution theory to the atomic theory, arguing that they both come at a higher level than fact, and attempt to explain tons of facts and givens of data by means of rational hypothesis and induction, and thus they draw the conclusion that if you rejected

[27] One of the most popular parables that paleontologists like to make about their profession, and use to charge children's enthusiasm for their field of research, is the way they describe themselves as "scientific detectives"! They say they are doing pretty much the same job as a detective who is examining physical evidence in attempt to solve a crime! Well, I say this is by all means a false analogy, and the reason is quite clear!

First of all, as a detective, I start my search from the point where I postulate a motive! This comes from the fact that no crime should take place without a motive! If you had that basic fact removed from the process, then there shall be no way any detective could ever solve any crime, or have any grounds to hold anybody suspect at all! A paleontologist on the other hand, builds on the assumption that **there can be no motive**, because there is no *suspect* at all in the first place! He sees no purpose beyond the past events that he claims to be examining, the way a detective does!

Thus, in crime analysis, a detective does not work his way with gathering evidence to prove that such a clearly perfect crime should have had no doer at all! He does not admit it to be a crime and then seek to prove that nobody did it! Furthermore; he is never so blind as to keep up with his theories and assumptions even when the real suspect comes forth and makes his confession, and is evidently and clearly – by necessity of reason - the only one capable of doing it!

Darwinian Evolutionism for the mere definition of it as a theory not a fact, then you might as well reject the Atomic theory (for example)! I argue that this is by all means a false analogy! This is because quite obviously, there is a major difference between the rational foundations upon which Darwinism and the atomic theory are built! Yes indeed both are theories, and both use scientific observation in adding further propositions and explanations to support the hypotheses; but what about the basic rationale upon which the hypothesis itself is founded, and its philosophical validity? How can they even claim the philosophical foundations of both theories to be analogous?

Not even close!

The atomic theory does not demand us to actually invert the way we make sense of reality around us! We do not have to counter our natural commonsense so we could accept it! It does not force us to put new meanings – false meanings – into language (the very tool that defines all mental processes of perception and cognition in man), and to "bite our own tongues" to not describe things we see in the world around us using the only right words we can think of to describe them! In short, the atomic theory does **not** stand upon a philosophy that is one millionth as rationally corrupt as the theory of Darwinian Evolution! And to us, Muslims, in addition to rational evidence, there is irrefutable scriptural evidence that **cannot** possibly be challenged by this caliber of scientific evidence!

In a public discussion that Dawkins held with physicist Lawrence Krauss, in Stanford University [28], Quantum physics was mentioned, and Krauss argued - those are not his exact words - that if people are finding trouble accepting Darwin's theory because it is counterintuitive, then they might as well reject all of quantum mechanics, a field where little next to nothing is understood by anybody! He uses the double-slit experiment as an example of how "counterintuitive" the very observations that we make at subatomic level are; they are objectionable he says! He says that when throwing a baseball as a projectile, it takes a certain path that is predictable, calculable, and quite rational! However, when you throw an electron, it takes unpredictable paths, and when thrown at a sheet with two slits, it does not act like any particle

[28] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZLctxRf7duU

should; it appears as though it passed through both slides simultaneously, and comes out on the other side to interfere with itself! He tries to impress the audience with the fact that this is certainly not a behavior that any reasonable man could understand of a particle (being in two places at the same time)!

Well, first of all, Dr. Krauss, you are indeed much smarter than make such a silly analogy; making people think that at subatomic level we should expect to see particles behave like baseballs! You know better than that! You know that at subatomic level quantum particles reveal their dual nature (wave-particle duality), and you know that at that level we humans are playing close to the point where the definitive boundary between energy and matter as we know them is (at least) hazed and obscured, taking the whole thing beyond our ability to model or predict (the way we do with a baseball)! I don't know if we'll ever comprehend the quantum world the way we comprehend the mechanics of a baseball, I have no reason to believe that we may not (although I find it to be quite unlikely); but we all agree that we currently don't know what exactly is going on down there!

So the reason why our grasp on particle activity at subatomic level is so fuzzy and our understanding of it is so unclear; is obviously because those particles are not really particles! They are more like packets of condensed energy with wave properties that we are only beginning to understand! Scientists have known about the dual nature of a photon (and obviously of electrons and almost every other quantum particle) for long enough now that you'd think they would realize the reason why it is clearly **not** behaving the way we may expect a baseball to behave! It does not conform to our mechanical definition of a particle; it's another physical entity. Thus an electron is certainly not to be analogized so easily to a baseball! It's not even a 'ball' to begin with!

This analogy reminds me of a time not too long ago when people used to think of the atomic structure as a 2-D circle (as in Bohr's first depiction of it at the beginning of the twentieth century) with a nucleus at the centre and electrons orbiting around it! Little do we know today, and much less did we know back then! So you really can't help wondering; what impact could

such an anti-rational approach to what's going on down there have on future research in this particular field? Is it about to turn into yet another doctrine of philosophical nonsense, rather than an actual discipline of natural science?

Yes we do not yet know how to explain such a duality, when and why an electron acts as a particle, and when and why it would behave as a wave or even as a mere packet of energy, and may – in fact - be approaching the limit of our human ability to model and theorize at that point; but this certainly does not justify the nonsensical interpretation by some philosopher of physics who would easily say: *"well, this proves that unlike anything man has ever seen or accepted: a particle could exist in two places at the same time"!* **Of course it couldn't! Nothing could**! This – to build upon the only tool that we humans have and trust for explanation and understanding – is certainly impossible; for anything at all to be in two places at the same time! We are not going to question the basic axioms of our human reason because of such postmodernist nonsense, are we?! This is indeed a grieve danger to all human knowledge; do not lose your grip on reality and reason just because you cannot explain certain patterns of behavior of subatomic particles! Snap out of that, professor Krauss, before you lose your mind!

What we observe down there is to be explained and understood only if one day we could understand this bizarre interference between the properties of matter, wave and energy, and explain it in terms of 1+1=2! Those properties are only distinctively articulated and defined in our current knowledge within a theoretical (mathematical) model that only deals reliably with the level of our common perception of the world! This is why it's not working at quantum level, and that's no surprise to any reasonable man! There's nothing irrational or counterintuitive about that! It's only natural human ignorance – at this stage of human history - about something that we see for the first time! An ignorance that may indeed turn into laughing material someday in the future!

Irrational interpretation = false interpretation! We have to be capable of throwing this judgment forcefully in the face of every enthusiastic physicist who starts speaking nonsense, and getting wet dreams because of what he

sees in his lab, because if we cannot make this distinction between rational and irrational, then science itself is a lost case, and nothing will ever make sense!

So do not make such a statement "Quantum mechanics makes no sense, so go ahead, become a Darwinian and let go of your reason", and propagate this nonsense as "consciousness raising"! This is a typical example of a fallacy seeking to be justified by complex ignorance, in addition to what you may call (argument from incredulity)! What could possibly be more miserable and anti-knowledge than such a position? And it comes from people who are viewed to be the elites of scientific academia! Those are the people who drive the process of science in the West today to its glorious future; and they're out to *enlighten* the world with what they believe!

Darwinism is obviously attempting - through the likes of Dawkins and Krauss - to have people convinced that it's okay to find a theory counterintuitive or even irrational, and be satisfied with it nonetheless, just as it is the case with many theories that seek to explain the quantum riddle! Well I say sorry professor; we do not accept irrationality or counter-intuition in Quantum physics any more than we do in Biology or in any other field of human knowledge for that matter! Our minds are not to be fooled or made fun of! This is not what they are there for! "Ridiculous observations" should not be given ridiculous explanations, because first of all there is no such a thing as "ridiculous" or (counterintuitive) observation; there's rather a currently unexplainable observation, or an observation that defies our ability to do any form of analogy, but not a "ridiculous" or "irrational" observation! And as for proposing explanations, it should come as firsthand logic, an A-B-C of human rationality, that there couldn't possibly be one object in two places at the same time; so any theory that bases its interpretations and explanations on this nonsense, is easily at the same rank with the Darwinian theory and should also be rejected and ridiculed! It builds over a fundamentally false rationale!

So be aware my kind reader that while sane people who do make sense of things and who demand a path of straight and healthy rationality should reject irrational quantum explanations just as they reject Darwinism, there

are people on the other hand who are trying so hard to have people accept Darwinism on the grounds that many people did accept counterintuitive (irrational) explanations that have been proposed in other fields of natural sciences, and did not file lawsuits against teaching them in schools! Well, I don't know about you my respectable reader, but to my mind this is an outrage!

So when Dawkins comments happily saying: *"Well, ridiculous observations call for ridiculous theories!"!* I can only comment saying: *"Well, ridiculous theories only come from ridiculous people, professor!"* And I thank God we're not that kind of people.

It is really sad to find so many evolutionists willing to debate with their opponents on every single aspect or detail of their marvelous story of natural history, the fossil record, the ancestry tree and so forth; yet they are so unwilling to address the core philosophy, science philosophy, at the level of rational foundations of the theory itself! It is only at that level that evolutionists might really see what exactly is wrong with the "science" of their theory; if they were ever willing to see! Good science and bad science is to be judged by the validity and rationality of the fundamental philosophy underneath any given theory of science, just as it is to be judged by the soundness of its observations and experiments! It is not to be judged by how many more findings you can explain on the same course of philosophy of an utterly "ridiculous" theory!

It's about time you realized, my atheist reader, that the money Jar is bottomless; it doesn't matter how many more coins you can drop in, through the slot on the top!

Quote:

> *"When challenged by a zealous Popperian to say how evolution could ever be falsified, J. B. S. Haldane famously growled: 'Fossil rabbits in the Precambrian.' No such anachronistic fossils have ever been authentically found, despite discredited creationist legends of human skulls in the Coal Measures and human footprints interspersed with dinosaurs'." (Delusion p.127)*

Even if you did find that fossil rabbit in the "Precambrian" one day, evolution still does not accord with Popper falsification principle, because there would still be a barrage of other possible explanations to such a finding, the least of which is the conclusion that rabbits may have evolved much earlier than is currently thought! Darwinians do that all the time, don't they? There's always a way out! So how could they possibly be falsified by any direct observation or empirical experimentation?! **Any observation that works as evidence only after it is given a theoretical explanation; can never end any theoretical debate on a theory of science! And that's the case with everything that evolutionists (and creationists in the most case) would call evidence!** There will always be exclamations like: "Oh, but we never found any such fossil!" or "If we find such a fossil then we will prove to be wrong!" or "Perhaps we will find this fossil one day, we haven't dug up all the Earth!" … etc. But the fact that they never found a certain fossil doesn't mean that it never existed, does it? There will always be an endless number of possible explanations, and never any form of direct observational proof to actually falsify Darwin's claims! We will never find a fossil or a genetic code or a complex biological system that disproves evolution in the eyes of its followers, the way a black swan disproves the statement that all swans are white! Only if we travelled back in time would we obtain such a kind of observation that either falsifies or validates any of the Darwinian claims in a way that leaves no room for any further philosophical objections, and that's simply impossible!

This is why people have got to understand that the scientific method does not work in favor of either of the two sides in the debate between atheists and the rest of mankind regarding the existence of God! It's just healthy reason versus sick reason! Some humans have got really sick and they need serious help; that's why there ever came to be such a debate!

The Cat and mouse game of fossils (or you may call it the fossil challenge game) is played by both sides of the debate in the west today: Christian creationists and evolutionists all the same! In fact I could even name a few Muslim scientists - who really know less about Islam than they know about the corrupt logic of Darwinism – who got themselves trapped in this futile

game of fossils nonetheless! Both teams are playing the game of what fossil to come up with, and where to put it; on the assumption that not finding any fossil remains of a particular form of species, is enough evidence to prove that it never existed, or that at least, it never lived in this or that age! This conviction had both teams busy searching eagerly for certain features in remains of dead animals, on the hope that they come up with a breakthrough "finding" that ends the debate! I really feel sorry for them all! What a waste!

Now this notion, the idea that they may actually keep searching desperately for a particular type of fossils forever and never manage to come up with one, has posed a great ideological threat over researchers in the West, which did in fact lead to many famous forgeries! This is why we have seen many scandals of **fake** fossils in attempt to fill the so called "missing link", mostly between man and his proclaimed ancestor! Those fakeries were indeed propagated and advocated strongly by science magazines and the media in general, deemed as scientific breakthroughs of their time, only to prove afterwards to have been nothing but cheap acts of forgery! Some evolutionists would easily fake a skull from some little fragments of a jaw bone, or even from a pig tooth for the sake of cheap glory, or for the achievement of a PHD degree or so!

Now in the light of such a poor rationale towards the meaning of a fossil finding and its radically false use as "evidence" on both sides of the debate, and the fact that they have been proven to easily commit such cheap acts; what credit of scientific integrity could any sane man still give to any of their proclaimed "substantial findings" now? How do you know they really found everything they claim they found, and that none of this is fake? They have already been proven to perform acts of deception and forgery and to have people believe them for years, so how could you people trust them on what they claim they have, and the way they manipulate it to make it support their story (according to their notion of evidence)? This is a moral question here! Not that this fossil frenzy really proves anything to either parties, we know it doesn't; the point here is the concept of forgery itself and the motive from whence it arises!

My point here is: how desperate is a scientist who would do something like this, for the sake of proving a theory of "natural science" towards which he's supposed to be skeptic? What does this theory really mean to him, if not a theory of natural sciences like all theories? Why not go out to the world and say: "I failed! The hypothesis in my thesis proved to be wrong, or did not prove to be right! I could not come up with a single observation that could qualify as indisputable evidence!"? Why not do that when it is revealed to you? Why lie? Why fake?

Well, the answer is simple! They lie because their personal **faith** depends on it; not to mention of course their academic careers as scientists!

What other theory of science in the history of mankind do you know has had such a reputation of having some researchers actually **forge** "evidence" to support it? This is not the work of a "skeptic" or "objective" scientist; it's the work of a desperate believer who feels challenged to prove the validity of his false faith, no matter what! It's the typical work of a minister of a false religion!

So given this fishy reputation with fossils; when Darwinians wage wars of propaganda against other findings that come from the opposite camp (like giant human skulls or mega-fauna [29] or the so-called out of place

[29] On a side note, it is narrated in the most authentic books of Hadith (AlBuhkary, Muslim and others) that prophet Muhammad Sallalahu Alihi wa sallam said: "**Allah created Adam at the height of sixty cubits, and then He said to him: Go and greet those Angels, and listen to their greeting; that should be your greeting and that of your offspring after you. So Adam said to them: "Peace be on you", they replied "Peace be on you and mercy from Allah", they added "mercy from Allah". Everybody who enters heaven will be in the size (and shape) of Adam. And ever since his time, humans have been decreasing (diminishing) in that." (AlBukhary, no. 3326)**

This Hadith tells us that the first man to walk this Earth was about 32 meters high (one cubit is about 56 cm), and ever since then, humans have been dropping gradually in size until today the tallest man would hardly exceed 2.4 meters! Some stubborn enemies of the truth would make fun of this Hadith and say it proves that Islam or Sunnah is false, whereas some ignorant Muslims would argue that it is not authentic because it cannot be true! First of all I emphasize that this Hadith is indeed at the highest level of authenticity there can be after the Qur'an, in the scholarly science of Hadith, so we have no reason whatsoever to doubt that those were the exact words of the prophet (Sallalahu Alihi wa sallam). Having said this, we remind every Muslim reader that there couldn't possibly be any rational objection whatsoever against a positively authenticated scripture of Islam, and this one is no exception! There's nothing irrational about Adam – regardless of how far back he lived in the past – being 32 meters tall! There's nothing irrational about the generations after him dropping gradually in hight, in lifetime spans, in physical power

(anomalous) archeological finds … etc) findings that are thought by creationists to support the opposite position, how is their media machine to be trusted on that? I mean, when they claim that all that their opponents ever claimed to have found – all of it – was nothing but myth or forgery, who could ever trust them on that claim?

I'm not claiming that the opposite team does not have cases of forgery as well (though I do not know of any particular case that was reported and exposed as forgery on the creationist side)! I can easily understand that when some immoral Christian scientist who lacks scientific integrity and honesty

---

and even in intelligence (and the capacity of memorization, for it is narrated in the Qur'an that Allah taught Adam the names of everything on Earth)! We Muslims need nothing more than the authentication of a single narrative of this story to believe it to be true! As for missionaries and atheists we tell them that we do not care what fossils say, we do not care what archeological finds may say, we do not raise such forensic theories at any level of valuable argumentation for or against such a story in our scripture! I can argue right now that those remains of mega-fauna and giant lizards (Dinosausrs) indicate that there was indeed a time when all – or most - elements of natural life were orders of magnitude larger than they are today (including man)! I can even argue that the proportion between man and the largest lizard in his time was kept the same even as this decrease in size took place! The Komodo Dragon (considered to be the largest Lizard on Earth today) could go as large as 3 meters (from tip of tail to tip of nostrils), whereas the average man today is 1.8 m tall. Keeping this proportion, how large do you expect man may have been at a time when the largest lizard around may have exceeded 40 meters of length? Well, you do the math! I can even argue that many "creationist" researchers did find remains of giant human skeletons, and highly sophisticated artifacts in strata where man was supposed to be nothing but a miserable hominid still hunting and gathering; findings which were all – for obvious reasons – expelled by the Darwinian community! I may even argue that ancient megalithic remains like the great pyramid in Egypt in which a single brick of stone weighs over seventy tons, could not have been built in antiquity time by any of those nonsensical Egyptologist explanations, and that at the time of its construction (whenever that was), it was in fact – relative to the scale of man – no higher than a two storey building at our current scale! I can go further with this, but I wouldn't do that! None of this conjectural archaeology proves anything or is even worthy argumentation to me, not to mention whatever conjectural responses atheists may come up with in response! A fool is a man who hangs his acceptance of the truth on such arguments! You want to believe there were never any giant humans on Earth because you never found such remains, or that the great pyramid was built by some aliens who have been toying with us ever since the dawn of mankind, or that man evolved only after dinosaurs became extinct; have it your way then, but do not dare accuse our scripture because of this nonsense! Muslim scholars do not take such ways to prove the validity of what their prophet teaches them! It suffices perfectly to blast away those silly objections, to say that there can be no rational objections whatsoever against this Hadith! Suppose you spent your entire lifetime and died without ever finding the fossil remains of a giant man, or any remains of certain great civilizations the Qur'an tells about (like the kingdom of Solomon for example, the remains of which Christian archeologists have been trying to find in total vain) what argument would you have on the Day of Judgment rejecting the truth because of this? Quit fooling yourselves atheists, and reconsider your choices before it's too late!

is driven by mainstream thought into believing in the value of fossils as "evidence" for or against Creation, he may easily be tempted to forge some fossils to help his case! I do understand this urge in a helpless man who openly declares that he is defending his faith (which doesn't change the fact that it is a forgery)! But when it comes from the opposite party, which claims to be skeptic regarding the tool of their science, and "faith free" (so to speak), and to be only doing a normal "natural sciences" research on a theory that is by nature, a man's proposition that should be open to refutation and replacement; this is something that should not be taken lightly! It further demonstrates that whatever atheists say about their being "skeptic" in their scientific query; they're actually lying to themselves as well as to others! It is indeed a war of faith on both sides, not just a debate on a theory of natural science!

Please note that when I say they cannot be trusted, I'm not talking about a scientist who can test every fossil in the lab first hand to check for himself the validity of the claim! I'm basically talking about the rest of the scientific community and the world on the watch; people to whom a fossil finding – its story and its denunciation all the same - is basically a piece of news; one that could impact the illiterate public deeply! How can *they* trust them now?

So when the author here speaks of "*discredited creationist* legends of human skulls in the Coal Measures and human footprints interspersed with dinosaurs'" I can only just sit back and enjoy the show! No sane man should decide his position in the most crucial issue of concern to every human being in this world; his position of faith towards his own creator (for or against), on the outcome of such a game of fiction and archaeological emptiness! None of this nonsense – on either sides of the debate - does any good at the level of argumentation and evidence at all!

The problem with the word "evidence" is that it does not always mean "proof"! It may sometimes only mean "a sign that supports a certain claim". So easily would an ardent atheist come to say that this is what they mean with their use of the word evidence! He'd say: "I never said that this or that evidence "proves" Darwinism! This is not what "evidence" means to me as a scientist!"

I'd then say; in all cases, and whatever the meaning you give to the word, or whatever the level of "proof" you think it establishes; the concept of using a hypothetical explanation for a certain finding to support a theory (a hypothesis in itself), and claim that the more of such "explanations" you can come up with and make accord with that theory, the more "true" it becomes: is only plausible argumentation if and only if you are not building the case for a rationally invalid or inconsistent theory! **No such accumulation of evidence could be strong enough to oppose – or to even challenge - the rational necessity of certain givens of axiomatic human reason**! This is a serious epistemic fallacy, and it is to be viewed as such in all disciplines of human knowledge!

I hope I do not have to make it any clearer that we **do** understand what a theory is, and how it is regarded in different disciplines of science and human knowledge. It is precisely why we so often say: "Darwinism stands no chance in this debate when it is **only a theory**"! [30]

Had the debate been held between two diverse theories that followed the very same methods in their postulation, building on equally justifiable rational basis, then we would've said: *okay, let's weigh the evidence on both sides and see which theory will tip the scale, and hence be viewed as a better candidate for an explanation*. However, neither is Darwinism in debate with another "theory" (creation was never a theory!), nor does it stand on sound foundations of reason to begin with! So there's no "scale" to tip at all!

Thus I say, I would've had no problem accepting such a model of accumulative supporting propositions and explanations (as a good suggestion for what the truth may be, as it is the case with many theories in many branches of science), had I not known in certainty that the rational

[30] In the literature of (Usoul al Fiqh: The foundations of jurisprudence in Islam) there is indeed the richest legacy of argumentation to be found anywhere on earth, on the issue of the ranking of evidence and the assessment of theorization in the deduction of rulings from given scriptures; a legacy that I say all scientists need to study, to take wisdom on how to evaluate the power of an evidence)! I do not describe it as 'rich' because of the efforts of its scholars – as great as it really is – but because of the fact that it is built – as a discipline – on the given wisdom of revelation! An argument or a rule is valid in this discipline basically because it relies on scriptural evidence and the induction thereof, in addition of course to its demonstrable rational validity! There's much that the world needs to learn from this discipline of knowledge to see how far atheistic reasoning has taken science and human knowledge in general from the ways of sound rationality and coherent argumentation.

foundations of this theory are scandalously false! This is why in debate, atheists are often reminded that unlike the meaning of creation, Darwinian evolution **is only a theory**! They need to understand what exactly they are pushing it against!

However, to them it is much more than “just a theory”! It is as deep a faith to them as every theist’s faith is to him! So you see them use the word theory and the word evidence over and over again, without any proper accord with its actual “size” as a proposition, in comparison to its opposition! They keep coming up with more explanatory stories for fossil findings thinking that the more they could come up with, the stronger their position of “evidence” becomes in the debate!

That’s what a Darwinian paleontologist – for example - does, typically! He follows his deep faith in making up every new explanation and theory for every new finding. He digs, brings out fossil remains, uses his imagination in identifying by selective analogy what kind of a species this specimen may belong to (no matter how scarce those remains may be), hypothesizes the rest of its structure and even gets an artist to fantasize what it may have looked like, in accordance – usually – with the “dating” info he gets, or the stratum he finds it in, makes up a story for it and places it somewhere in his flexible myth of Darwinian ancestry tree, then puts it – when he’s done - in some museum of natural sciences and have people believe that this is another breakthrough that further solidifies Darwinism! This is what they typically call a new addition to their score of “overwhelming” evidence!

I have to admit that their ability to make up such stories the way they do on every fossil they add to their gallery, and accumulate upon their mainframe of theory is really impressive; takes a vast span of creativity and imagination I should say; I mean not everybody could come up with such detailed sketches of a “hominid”, the way it looked, the way it fed, lived, and “hunted” its food, based only on a tooth, a fraction of a lower jaw bone, and some piece of crude pointed stone! But what on Earth does any of this fiction, offer to human knowledge at the level of **“proof”** for Darwinism versus the rational necessity of creation?

It offers nothing – in reality – for the sake of proving Darwin's case! No matter how many of such "evidences" they come up with, the theory will always be no more than a monumental work of fiction that could've never lived that long, had it not been for the faithfulness and sheer devotion of atheist scientists all over the world!

Thus I stand justified when I hold that Darwinism is simply an out of scope theory! It's a fundamentally wrong application of the scientific method! It seeks answers to certain questions in all the wrong places, and refuses to see why it is wrong! After admitting the irrefutable necessity of God being there, questions like, who He is, **where we came from,** Why He made us and what He wants of us, and where we all go to when we die, are clearly not questions of natural science or even philosophy! This knowledge **has to be received** from Him; and nowhere else, and it has to be authenticated – as a source – beyond any reasonable doubt! It's an epistemological necessity!

Thus we say that believers in the creator, followers of all religions other than atheism and its branches, do not take what they have about the question of origins and the existence of God for the work of theory proposed by a man in some branch of natural sciences or philosophy; this is not what they claim it to be! So you cannot ask them to approach those issues with *skepticism*! Regardless of whether or not they can prove their particular position of faith to be the truth; it is – naturally – a position of **certainty** to them, by definition! This is why emphasis is made here and in every argument by every follower of religion on the heaviest meaning of proof rather than this wishful probabilistic thinking that Darwinians – like many other theorists in other branches of natural science - would call "pieces of evidence"! This is why they're usually saying, as they criticize Darwinian argumentation for atheism: "**This doesn't prove anything**"! [31]

The position is usually expressed as such: "who are you to tell me to let go of the existence of God, the omniscient creator, for the sake of some human theory?" This objection stands justifiable regardless of the validity of the

[31] This is why when some humanist association once placed a poster on the side of a bus in England that read *(There's probably no God, Now stop worrying and enjoy your life),* all sensible people made a joke out of it!

particular doctrine of faith to which its holder may belong! Basic belief in the existence of the creator is independent of what this or that religion teaches about Him! It is a rational necessity upon which all theistic religions are built!

Naturally a believer in God has full support of pure human reason at the level of accepting the creator; the kind of reason that Darwinians are fighting windmills for the sake of subverting! This certainty in the natural meaning of creation is what makes us dismiss and ridicule – with confidence - everything that they have ever come to view as evidence for their miserable theory, because quite simply: **Rational necessities (naturally qualifying as certainties) cannot be overcome by accumulating theoretical probabilities!** They must offer an irrefutable proof; which is something they know they don't have and never will. And it is not possible – rationally - that there could ever be a case where man discovers irrefutable proof for something that destroys the very basics of rationality!

So what are the options now for a Darwinian preacher to have people accept his theories in place of their rationally necessitated and intuitively ascertained faith in the creator?

Well, he finds – just like Dawkins does here in "the Delusion" – he has no choice but to move to plan B! To shift from the strategy of attempting to convince a believer in God with Darwinism, to the strategy of proving to him that his religion is false; which is of course an easy task to take on when the religion is indeed not the true revelation of the creator! So once the poor victim loses the grounds of certainty that he has always granted for his book and his religious leaders, he is left in deep confusion, uncertainty and bitterness; and at that point, he is easily fooled into believing that all religion is fiction all the same, and that only in "science" – namely Darwinism - could he find his asylum! It's this extreme psychological reaction that atheism really feeds upon!

At that point they would have him convinced that there is no creator at all, even though they actually did nothing more than prove to him that his own religion in particular – which ascribes itself to the creator like all other

religions do – is false or corrupt! So whatever does this particular conclusion have to do with the natural and perfectly rational necessity of there being a creator? Nothing at all! They'd tell him: "*well, now that you've lost your previous certainty in your religion, come join our camp and accept the closest thing we can get to an answer to the major questions of life; Darwinism"!*

This is why this book, this "Delusion", is structured as such! If you don't find Darwinist beliefs about the metaphysical convenient enough through the first couple of chapters, then let us show you before we wind up, what "evils" religion has caused in the world! Becoming a Darwinian is a typical act of conversion from a previous religion to the doctrine of atheism, and that's exactly what Dawkins admits his book to be about!

So do not speak of those fossils or any other findings as evidence; because clearly they are not! This pathetic chase of remains of dead animals is **not** the way to learn the truth about our origins for those who truly seek it!

Thus in conclusion I say; those "pieces of evidence" really account for nothing in terms of "proof" here, no matter how plentiful they are, or how coherent they may seem to be! They would always be nothing but additional detailed assumptions branching from a big assumption that is basically un-provable; and is fundamentally anti-rational and counterintuitive at the core!

It doesn't matter how many more bricks you can pile up in a wall or how you can make a brick fit in some hole in this wall, when you actually have no footing down at foundation level for the wall to keep standing in the first place!

Quote:

> *"The speedy resort to a dramatic proclamation of 'irreducible complexity' represents a failure of the imagination."* (Delusion p.128)

One can easily take notice of a lot of similar comments throughout the book by the professor! It's the typical attempt by every atheist to depress or intimidate his opponent by describing him as "unimaginative" or "un-insightful", making him feel like a mindless advocate of faith who really has

no conception of "science" and no valuable knowledge to offer to the question in hand! Atheists do that all the time. However, without reasonable evidence and good argumentation, it is nothing but empty noise! Only the power of one's arguments is what justifies his tone of speech and his attitudes after all!

As for failure of imagination, I just admitted that Darwinians do enjoy a great deal of imagination indeed! And so does every talented fiction novelist around! But we're not in for science fiction, are we?! We're here for the truth! How much imagination you have in the stories you make up is – thus – irrelevant to our query here!

I have also elaborated that the reason we always come out from refuting Darwinian mythology by going straight to "Creation" is that creation is really the only rational and sensible meaning that every healthy human mind is bound to see by default! All along their literature, Darwinians themselves admit repeatedly that Darwinism is to them but a "worthwhile substitute" or "alternative"! They are always on the quest and claim to "prove" it to be a good **alternative**! They do admit that by default all healthy humans think nothing but creation and perfectness at it nonetheless! Thus they acknowledge that humans have to alter the way they normally make sense of things, in order to swallow Darwinism! So how come they complain now that whenever a certain "particular" postulate of Darwinism is refuted or argued against, people would resort by default to creation in its stead?

What – on Earth – do they expect?

He comments:

> *"You might as well simply assert that the weasel frog (bombardier beetle, etc.) demonstrates design, without further argument or justification. That is no way to do science." (Delusion p.128)*

Now this statement here is by all means a disgrace to human knowledge, rationality and common sense! It exposes – in the clearest possible words – the magnitude of the mental darkness that Darwinism – like many nonsensical philosophies - has befallen on humanity! If I cannot assert that

the weasel frog "demonstrated design" without further argument or justification; then I cannot assert that **anything at all** demonstrated design without further argument and justification, and if this is the case, then I should really go get some serious help! If I cannot identify such a meaning in what I see around me, and I feel I still need further justification to describe something as "beautiful" or "organized" or "systematized" or "designed" when I see it, and realize by virtue of linguistic meaning that there must be a perfectly creative doer of these deeds; then I am no better than a poor postmodernist who questions the meaning of "truth" or doubts the existence of "reality" and suspends his belief in those meanings until they are proven by "further argumentation or justification" to be "true"! Don't you agree, professor, that this a joke? Seeking to **prove truth** to be **true**? How do people know that truth is true?

When some poor psychopath argues that there's no truth, or that truth is a relative value, people should have the courage and the mental integrity to deplore him forcefully saying**: If that were the case then there's no proof for the validity of any argument whatsoever (including this argument of yours here); so go play with little kids**! There would be no such thing as "proof" or "evidence" to begin with, if we went down to this level! Some meanings and axioms of human reason and language cannot and should not be messed with; otherwise, nothing will have any meaning, and argumentation would only be a pathetic play of empty words! No decent man who respects his mental integrity should allow this nonsense or give it any degree of credibility! Yet you, professor, see those sick people made into intellectual icons and heroes in your society, and you don't find it a noble cause to spout your disdain on *them*! Probably you don't understand a single word they write; so you figure; well, there should be others who do, otherwise how did people like (Derrida, Baudrillard and others) become members of western intelligentsia? And even though this intrinsic contradiction and sheer irrationality in postmodernist nonsense is too clear to demand a proof (it destroys the meaning of proof itself!); postmodernism did pervade and people found themselves applauding the meaningless mental vomit – pun and offense intended here! - that postmodernists present in their works, just in fear that if one of them stood up and said: "This is nonsense",

he would be accused of stupidity, ignorance, or at least poor intellect and a *consciousness* that is not sufficiently "*raised*"! *"You don't know the first thing about postmodernism"* those "pioneer philosophers" would easily say! Is this not sheer hypocrisy?

If I cannot trust my natural human faculties of cognition and sensibility, then what is the point of thinking or even living at all?

If every time I look at an obviously well functioning system (it cannot be described by any other words) and say "it was made up – set up – composed – created - … etc - masterfully"; I have to be reminded by some deranged philosopher that when I say "made up", I shouldn't by necessity mean that it is "designed" or "made up **BY X**, where X is a masterful maker who designed everything in it, and put it in its right place according to a previously determined purpose", and that in fact the truth could be the exact opposite to this meaning; then the world is indeed a sorry place! The end result is that we have no reliable conception of any of these very meanings themselves: Design, purpose, making, maker, … etc.! If every time a man says "selected" he is told that he still needs to make an argument to prove that this meaning necessitates that there be a "selector", and to justify this linguistic necessity inherent in the very definition of the "passive voice" itself, then we are indeed in deep trouble, and we can no longer make sense of the words we use!

"Anti-rational" is indeed the only proper word to describe such a philosopher, not just "irrational"! That's what Darwinism is in reality; Anti-rational philosophy in a disguise of science and rationality! But in a crazy world where our very conception of reality and truth is no longer valid, and our perception and natural linguistic abilities are no longer to be trusted; whatever does the word "*rational*" even mean at all? And whatever should stop people from accepting Darwin's contribution to such a world in demise? After all, life is only a meaningless crazy place where nothing is certain or makes any sense!

This is why it never fails to amaze me to see Dawkins emphasize on the meaning of "evidence" and "proof", lamenting postmodernists and the way

they mess around with those meanings! What on Earth – then – do you think Darwinism is doing to your own cognition, professor?

It does not take a scientist to make out the difference between night and day! What argument does any sane man need beyond the overwhelming perfectness of a weasel frog which only takes two eyes and a healthy mind to admit? You say: that's no way to do science; I say actually that's no issue to do science for in the first place! **Science does not test basic axioms of human reason or challenge them; it presupposes them**! Science is only one of many fruits of those axioms in human life! That's how things work! The very simplest and clearest of all meanings that a man knows, needs no "science" done to argue for it or justify it! I do not need to 'demonstrate' the fact that the weasel frog is masterfully created; not by removing its limb or any other part of its body! I just need to have a pair of eyes and a healthy mind that works properly; that's all!

No reasonable man needs any demonstration to prove that the frog would go cripple – malfunction – at the loss of a limb, or blind at the loss of an eye, and would be in great danger of perishing because of that loss! I wonder now, if this is not – in concept - "irreducible complexity" then what is it? What is the outcome of removing a frog's limb that would have him admit that it is *'irreducibly complex'*? Does he expect it to – perhaps – die or to fail in survival? Well, nobody can prove that survival is the only function or purpose of a living being – Darwinians have it for a given fact though! – Yet, even with the little that science knows today, it is evident enough that without a limb, a joint or an eye, it will indeed fail to survive!

A living being is indeed a huge set of functions and purposes, as we elaborated earlier; systems and subsystems that make it this perfectly adapted and perfectly functional creature that we see in nature! So what kind of a demonstration is he asking for to believe that it is indeed perfect just the way it is, and that it can't be this way without a maker who defines this perfection in the way that it is and the way that we perceive it? And if the only purpose of an element of any compound system in organic life is – to him - to assure survival, then what good is half a limb every time it's imperative for it to escape the attack of a predator, for example? Will he

rejoice in finding a part that when removed from the frog's body, it will not die, and he will not see any obvious, immediate or long term change in the way it lives? Will he then claim that it is reducible? Typically; an argument from complex ignorance!

Quote*:*

> *"The logic turns out to be no more convincing than this: 'I [insert own name] am personally unable to think of any way in which [insert biological phenomenon] could have been built up step by step. Therefore it is irreducibly complex."*(The Delusion p.128)

Well, how about this: *"I (insert own name) am so arrogant and stubborn and thus I'm personally unable to admit the perfection that I see in the way organic systems work, and the rational necessity that follows from there, that every part of it must have a function even if I did not know it yet*!"?

Think about it!

It should be made clear that whatever meaning an atheist gives to reducibility, it is false! Nothing in natural life can be reduced the way they claim, and not fail on one or more level of functionality!

In a TV interview, Kenneth Miller commented that Behe's famous example of the mouse trap does not prove irreducibility! [32]

His point was that without a bate and a pin (two parts without which it cannot work as a mouse trap), it can easily serve as a tie holder or a paper clip or even a "spit ball" launcher; ergo it is reducible! Now what on Earth is this man talking about? Behe's example was the **mouse trap**! The artifact that serves as a **mouse trap**; not as a paper clip or a tie holder! Once you remove one of its parts; it's clearly no longer fit to function **as a mouse trap**! When you reduce it, you are obviously demolishing the particular **job** it was made for! And that's the whole point of irreducibility in a well

[32] (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rW_2lLG9EZM)

“designed” system! This artifact only works **as a mouse trap** with all those parts fit in place! It doesn’t matter then what *other* job it may *be used for* in its new “context”! That would be you thinking of a new job for a new system that emerged from your modification, which is not the original purpose for which the designer of the original artifact made it!

So whatever the artifact may be used for after the modification is clearly irrelevant to the debate, because we are only talking about the function of trapping mice for which it was already designed! We define an organ by the function (or the top function in a set of functions) that a certain part of an organic system appears – within our currently limited knowledge of it - to perform. So once you speak of another function or a different set of functions; you’re clearly speaking of **another** organ, part of another system, in another context, by definition!

I remember watching a somehow “smarter” young atheist fellow on Youtube trying in vain to demonstrate that a mouse trap may still work well *as a mouse trap* even with some of those parts removed! The guy obviously understood the concept of irreducibility better than Dr. Miller did, but his attempt was equally pointless. It was pretty obvious that after the reduction, the trap wasn’t as efficient as the original design was, due to all those parts he removed! And yet I will have to disappoint him and say that if indeed this thing was at least equally efficient as a mouse trap after the removal of those parts, then this is because the human designer who made it was not good enough, and this modification of yours will indeed be a good economic suggestion to develop this artifact in the future! So good for you kid, you proved smarter than the designer of the mouse trap; but that’s all you really proved! Organic systems are obviously not mice traps designed by limited humans like ourselves! We know too little indeed about the infinite number of subsystems in function in even the smallest and simplest of organs in our bodies!

Behe’s definition of an irreducibly complex system was originally put as thus: “*A single system which is composed of several interacting parts that contribute to the basic function, and where the removal of any one of the*

parts causes the system to effectively cease functioning." (Behe, Darwin's Black Box, p39, 2006 edition)

Now even the clearest of organs we know of cannot be said with certainty to have exclusively one function for each and every element in it, which serves none but the apparent function of the organ itself! Sets of functions may intersect and overlap, and since the definition of an organ is based upon function, and since we still learn more about those functions every day, a system's purpose will never be final or absolute to our notion! You do not have the blueprint for this design and you are only beginning to understand the perfect and unbelievably complex way in which it works! We can only speak of particular functions that we know relate directly to a particular part or set of parts, according to the amount of knowledge we currently possess of a given organic system! Thus, Any part that may not appear – at our current status of knowledge - to contribute to a certain organic function that we currently recognize and attribute to one system or another as its "basic function", cannot be dubbed – so arrogantly - "reducible"!

Evolutionists used to make this boorish claim about the appendix in man, (placing Darwinism in that 'gap') and now they are only starting to learn some of its functions!

In an article in (The scientific American) [33], Loren G. Martin, professor of physiology at Oklahoma state university declares:

> *For years, the appendix was credited with very little physiological function. We now know, however, that the appendix serves an important role in the fetus and in young adults. Endocrine cells appear in the appendix of the human fetus at around the 11th week of development. These endocrine cells of the fetal appendix have been shown to produce various biogenic amines and peptide hormones, compounds that assist with various biological control (homeostatic) mechanisms. There had been little prior evidence of this or any other*

[33] (http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=what-is-the-function-of-t)

> *role of the appendix in animal research, because the appendix does not exist in domestic mammals.*

He adds:

> *Among adult humans, the appendix is now thought to be involved primarily in immune functions. Lymphoid tissue begins to accumulate in the appendix shortly after birth and reaches a peak between the second and third decades of life, decreasing rapidly thereafter and practically disappearing after the age of 60. During the early years of development, however, the appendix has been shown to function as a lymphoid organ, assisting with the maturation of B lymphocytes (one variety of white blood cell) and in the production of the class of antibodies known as immunoglobulin A (IgA) antibodies. Researchers have also shown that the appendix is involved in the production of molecules that help to direct the movement of lymphocytes to various other locations in the body.*

Now I wonder how much more we may learn about it tomorrow! And how dare any Darwinian then dismiss it as a functionless "leftover"? [34]

The point is: Nothing in nature is reducible! Nothing is functionless! The nature of human knowledge does not give any man the right to pass such a judgment on a system that is obviously and infinitely flawless!

Translation of the meanings of the Qur'an (67|3-4): ***(((He) who has created seven heavens in harmony. You can see no fault in the Beneficent One's creation; so look again: Can you see any rifts? Then look again and yet again, your sight will return unto you weakened and made dim.))***

---

[34] Even the coccyx which some evolutionists so presumptuously dismiss in man as an "evolutionary leftover", is mentioned in authentic Hadith as the part of the body from within which humans will be resurrected in the day of resurrection. We may or may not get to discover other functions that it plays in our bodies as it is, but the point is that even if we never found out why it is there: **We know too little**, and we will never have the knowledge that gives us the right to judge it or any other organic system as "functionless" or "leftover"! Any biologist who respects himself and the nature of his object of research should make this confession! Why wouldn't he just say: "**We don't know yet**, maybe we will find out tomorrow"? Why jump and place Darwin's nonsense in this gap of knowledge, on the previous judgment that the 'design' is – against what our very eyes tell us –"imperfect"? Well, we all know the answer to that, don't we? Because they are at war with human reason and perception for the sake of convincing themselves and others that none of this was "created" to begin with! That's what atheism does to its followers! **Imperfection and reductionism in the Gaps!**

Now, suppose I rephrased the concept of irreducibility as such: "For any single functional system composed of several attached parts; the removal of any one of those parts should cause the system to effectively cease functioning entirely or partially (in one of its functions)."

Meaning that by reduction it either ceases to function entirely, or its performance drops due to loss in some of its sub-functions.

What would you say to that?

To cut it short: **Reducing parts = altering design = damaging (or changing) original function**. This meaning applies to everything that we may call "composite system". It follows from the determinism of causality in nature. A function may be defined (causally) as a desired 'effect' that follows naturally every time a group of specifically organized 'causes' is put to work in a predetermined manner. Thus it is clear that once a cause is altered, the effect will be altered. A particular effect (X) should demand a particular cause or set of causes (Y) to be obtained! If (Y) is changed, then (X) (which may be a set of effects as well) cannot be obtained!

If the system could work after the reduction as something else, and that was intended as a purposeful modification to it, then that's a change in the system, a redesign so to speak! But if not, then it's simply an act of "sabotage", because functions will be wasted; data will be lost! Period! And if the removal of a certain part does not affect a functional system in any way, then it wasn't part of the system in the first place; by definition!

So it stands perfectly clear that the rephrased argument of irreducibility is as rationally sound and straightforward as the meaning of the word "function" and "system" itself! It is just like saying: a system that is obviously functioning in perfectness; must be a perfectly designed or created system, where every part or component should matter in a way we may or may not know! No functioning system that is made –as a system – of parts, would continue to function – by definition - as the same system that it was, once a part of it is removed! This is true of everything that a sane healthy man could call "functional" and "system" by linguistic definition!

So to sum it up, the basic logic beneath IC is quite clear and irrefutable, - regardless of Behe's particular statement - and should not be described as a "theory"! To put it again in biological terms: "Any organism that has parts (organs), will never be capable of functioning as properly as it should (failure at some level), if one of those parts was removed"!

In their debate against IC, Darwinians often bring up – like Dawkins does here – the example of the eye, and claim that they have evidence to prove that even the eye could be reduced!

When they so easily claim that they do have evidence in nature to prove that the eye '*could have* evolved' through lesser (simpler) steps; they neglect one major fact that cannot be dismissed! Let alone the fact that they take "simple" to be synonymous to less perfect, they forget that each and every one of those species they see today in nature; has an "eye" – or some analogous organ – that is **perfectly functional** for its host species just as it is!

A nautilus for example clearly needs no more of an eye, and no more of the functions of sight than it has! Thus it is clearly false to claim that a more complex eye like ours is an *evolution* for it! And clearly, on the other hand, we need not have a compound 3D eye like that of a gnat, a fly or a bee! So a fly's eye isn't any more "evolved" than ours! Why is it so difficult for them to see that those many species they view as "lesser" or "primitive", and claim to have been steps on the ladder of evolution, are indeed all perfect, each in the particular place it in is today, doing just what it does, with no need for any additional biological parts or subsystems?

What I see is the perfect work of a perfect creator who puts everything He creates in its right place, for its exact purpose, not a single cell lacking or in excess! The obvious perfectness of each and every step they use as example for their claimed "evolution" of the eye proves just that! Perfectness of creation is by definition the success of a created system in doing what it is supposed to be doing! And obviously, this is the case with every living species that we have ever seen on Earth! It is – in itself, as it is – perfect and needs not evolve in any way! Yet they use "less complex" organs in certain

species to prove nothing more than the mere "probability" of there being lesser forms in our claimed ancestry! Again I say this position of lesser and more evolved is rationally false, because just like we see such life forms today in perfect accord with their places in the system, we have no reason to believe that it was any otherwise, any time in the past! And clearly, no reason to believe that such an organism ever had to evolve by natural selection! Just the fact that we can see different species with different "structures" of an eye, varied in the degree of complexity and optical power, does not mean that they represent lesser – or higher - eyes on any ladder of heredity!

None of them is in fact any less perfect than the other! Because to judge them, we should not compare them to one another according to the degree of their complexity, or according to the job that one of them in particular is doing, but according to whether or not every one of them is doing what it is supposed to be doing; and that's clearly not the same exact job (set of definitive functions)! **Complexity is not a standard prerequisite for perfectness of functionality!** If device A is more complex by design than device B, and both devices seem to be doing the same kind of job but in two different systems that have different purposes of design, then it is not at all a necessity that device B will function better in its place if it was made as complex as device A, or that A would function better in its place if it was reduced in complexity to be similar to B!

Something may be too complex, just as it may be too simple; in both cases it is **not** perfect! Quite clearly, nothing in nature or in natural life is too simple or too complex to do what it is there to do, just the way it is!

If an organism will do perfectly with only a patch of photoreceptive cells, according to the extent of eyesight that it needs for its vitality and for the purpose for which it is made, then it is perfect with nothing more than just that; not a single cell more! And if one day such a species was discovered, it will only prove further variety and mastery in the works of the creator; not that there once was no eye on Earth but this patch of cells as ancestor to all eyes! Its mere existence today and its survival and prosperity with no more than just this, is in itself a sign of perfectness in design, not otherwise!

Additional complexity in this organ in this context will then not be an "evolution" for that species at all; it will actually be a defect!

Watch as the author gives an example that is totally irrelevant for the attitude of humans that are not atheists. He recounts the story of a magical trick that he watched by Ben and Teller, and comments:

> *"I [Richard Dawkins] am utterly unable to think of any way in which this could be a trick. The Argument from Personal Incredulity screams from the depths of my prescientific brain centres, and almost compels me to say, 'It must be a miracle' "(The Delusion p.129)*

It is sad really, but this is the "high" place where Darwinism places the "consciousness" of its followers! I ask the professor: Do you really believe that the way those magicians pulled their trick, is comparable to the way the universe and natural life came to be? Do you really believe that creation and people's natural acceptance of it and belief in it; is a trick they are all just fooled into believing? Do you really think your mind is playing a trick on you? Well yes it is! All atheists suffer from that, because they chose to do it to themselves! They chose to challenge their own minds and their own senses!

Translation of meanings of verse (7|179): ***((…(They) have hearts wherewith they understand not, and eyes wherewith they see not, and ears wherewith they hear not. These are as the cattle; nay, but they are even worse! These are the neglectful))***

I quote the Qur'an as it describes in one of many verses how blind they are, for they act as though they never saw a single sign or heard a single argument to prove them wrong; they would reject it no matter how clear that proof is!

Christians would probably quote Psalm 53 (*The fool has said in his heart there is no God*), and it would also fit right in place! Although one cannot tell the authenticity of this text, thus I cannot ascribe it to the Lord; I find it very expressive in this context nonetheless, and it may in fact be part of the remains of heavenly revelation that are scattered in 'Psalms'!

Personal incredulity, professor, is what a man suffers from when he refuses the givens of sound human reasoning, insists on taking in corrupt philosophies and embraces them regardless of the strain and effort he has to exert in order to convince himself that he is okay with them, and that they could qualify for the truth!

Look at the incredulity in his comment on the analogy of a stone arch as an irreducibly complex structure. He admits that it must have had scaffolding, and then he says:

> *"In evolution, too, the organ or structure you are looking at may have had scaffolding in an ancestor which has since been removed'*

Can't he listen to himself? What is "scaffolding" now, if not a device made precisely for the purpose of bracing and carefully laying bricks on it in a predetermined way for a predetermined purpose? The injection of scaffolding in evolution certainly destroys both its pillars (random mutation and natural selection); even an atheist should see that much! But we must not be tempted to believe that he actually means (scaffolding), mind you!

We are now supposed to believe that some lucky random mutation not only came around just in time, and not only offered a new working addition just in place; it actually offered us a scaffolding for a design that would work once it is finished – all by the success of many steps of **chance** –, to save the species and offer it a perfect organ that it desperately needed at that point! How impressive indeed!

And as I argued earlier, the parable of mount improbable should be rewritten – using their understanding of probability – to state that by climbing mount improbable, you are actually going: (improbable) x (more improbable) x (much more improbable) x … etc.! So obviously once at the peak, you will have gone through something that may indeed be – as a residual - a billion billion times as improbable as the single leap of willful creation at the other side of the mountain is claimed to be!

It is very interesting that he makes this confession:

> *"The origin of life only had to happen once. We therefore can allow it to have been an extremely improbable event, many orders of magnitude more improbable than most people realize, as I shall show. Subsequent evolutionary steps are duplicated, in more or less similar ways, throughout millions and millions of species independently, and continually and repeatedly throughout geological time. Therefore, to explain the evolution of complex life, we cannot resort to the same kind of statistical reasoning as we are able to apply to the origin of life."(The delusion p. 135)*

Well, In fact professor, you must do much more work in revision of the very definition and meaning of statistical reasoning itself, because this is not how it should be applied; this is not what it is for!

He then argues against the example of the flagellar motor as an irreducible system. **He snatches at the understanding that for a system to be irreducibly complex, none of its parts should be functional on its own!** Again I should state that this is a corrupt understanding of the very concept of functionality as a definer of a particular system! Yes of course if I detached a pin from a computer machine, I could easily use that pin in another machine, or even use it to hang a painting on the wall of my room! But this is not what the original system uses this pin for, and it is obviously not working as properly as it should without that pin! The system would not function the way it should, with any of its parts detached! Forget about the fact that every part of it may easily be used in separate for another function (by another designer), because clearly on doing so, you are speaking of a different system, doing another function that cannot be done the way it should be done, with any of that other system's parts detached as well!

Quote:

> *"The protein molecules that form the structure of the TTSS are very similar to components of the flagellar motor. To the evolutionist it is clear that TTSS components were commandeered for a new, but not wholly unrelated, function when the flagellar motor evolved."(The Delusion p.132)*

He celebrates Miller's description of TTSS and bacterial structures, explaining how he finds it to be identical to that functioning in the flagellar motor, concluding that this proves the motor to be *reducible*! There you got it; they have proven to you that there is indeed another biological system that has similar parts, meaning that those very same parts could be seen to have another function in another system! That's great! But, whatever does this have to do with proving that the system of the Flagellar motor *could be* reduced, in the sense that it could be made to perform this very same function without the previous assembly of all those parts in it in this particular composition beforehand?!

We have two distinct systems, the TTS structure and the Flagellar motor; both share common parts but with different functions; now what on Earth does this have to do with the fact that none of the two systems can function properly without its parts attached to one another and in exactly the right places? How did it come to be *'clear to the evolutionist'* that the TTS components were "commandeered" **(By whom?)** to function as components of the Flagellar motor, just because they are apparently identical in a huge part of their molecular structure?

Again, another false unacceptable explanation, because I could easily claim that both systems evolved from a different source (which I equally find impossible); a third system of my picking or of the making of my wild fantasy, and they couldn't tell me I'm wrong! Or I could easily claim that they had nothing to do with one another and that they both evolved separately and it's only out of sheer coincidence that they happened to share parts that are identical! I could easily think of a dozen other possible stories for the origins of both systems, but I don't need to; all I see is that those parts were determinately created for functions that demand of them to be identical in structure but with different roles for each of them in its particular system in its particular context! Nothing more needs to be said!

The point is: not a single evolutionist could possibly prove me wrong when I claim those explanations to be possible!

So what is it that makes it *clear* to you as an evolutionist, professor, that this is what happened back in time and it is what justifies this similarity in particular parts between the two systems? Sheer bias and ‘blind faith’ driven arguments; that’s what!

We are obviously talking about two parts of two distinct systems with two distinct functions! So it’s really sad that someone would actually insist on claiming such a hypothetical link between their origins imagining that this claim would work as an argument to disprove irreducibility in the way they both serve their distinct purposes as they are, and would thus refute the very meaning of irreducibility altogether!

Again we remind the reader that a mouse trap is not a mouse trap unless it has all the “mouse trap parts” in place, prepared specifically for this purpose! So when he takes away some of its parts and says it could function then as something else; this is totally irrelevant, because quite clearly we are not talking about something else! We are stating the fact that a mouse trap could not be called a mouse trap – on the outset of it - without those particular parts attached! Anything else is just that: Something else! Pure and simple!

An organism could not have come into being and survived as a species without a certain system with a particular function in it, and that system could not do that function without those very parts attached to one another, all doing just what they are supposed to do! This remains to be the case no matter how simple a system is (even in a unicellular organism) Therefore this system with this function could not have evolved from a different system with a different function! How many parts should come around, all in the exact place that each of them should be, and each by a purely random event of mutation, and stay there through generations of an endangered species, all so that eventually a working organ will start to work once all its parts are in place? And how are we supposed to believe – based on the Dawkins argument from probability - that this ‘unbelievably lucky’ emergence of parts was the source of information for all organs in every species on Earth?

The fact that a system with a certain function is seen to have more functional parts or elements than another system in another being that may be doing a similar function or sharing the same components of the other system but in a different structure; this fact **cannot** be taken to refute creation or even the concept of IC as worded by Behe! It proves that there could be another system with similar parts doing a different job! This is true, and it is quite obvious indeed! But it is clearly not an argument to refute creation or irreducibility of biological systems, not to mention proving common ancestry! Irreducibility is actually a definitive property of any set of elements that could be called 'system' to begin with, so those examples they bring forth of systems that have common parts doing a different job in each one of them; they really prove nothing!

For any given function (X), if organ (A) is working properly in its context (at any given instant of time), then it cannot be reduced, neither does it need any "evolution"! If however it is not functioning properly, then it should fail! The addition of a new part to that organ is not as simple as a number of cells just popping up in place, giving rise to the new desired part! The entire system has to be redesigned and reprogrammed in order for the new part to come in its right place – which would then be (the right place) by definition – and raise the performance as *desired*! Not only the organ itself has to be changed, the entire body has to be modified in the way its biological processes run, for the sake of the new comer to work in harmony; the brain itself and its neural paths have to be modified! Do you think that all we need to do if we one day wished to evolve our eyes into those of a fly – for example – so we could see front and back at the same time, all we will need to do is take off those eyes in our faces and fix big fly eyes in their place? Whatever you claim, we are talking about a change that is no less than a purposeful and perfectly organized act of "redesign" here, which includes the entire body; one that couldn't possibly be pulled off by some blind random mutation! We're talking about total *redesign* for the sake of a new set of functions all over!

I mean, come on; if that's not determinate (function redefinition), setting down a previously determined course (scaffolding) for the process which is

of course **not** something that Darwinian mechanisms could do, then what is it? Or are we supposed to imagine gradual steps for that change between the two systems, the initial and the final, where some parts had their specific functions altered (for the sake of the new function that is to emerge at the end), while others did not? Well this would easily mean the failure of the old system plus the impossibility of there ever emerging a new one from it! Because at that intermediate point it's clearly neither doing the old nor the new function! It has lost some of its parts for the sake of a new function that cannot be performed by those few altered parts alone! So it is neither working as the old system, nor as the new one at that point, and thus; it couldn't possibly be selected to continue, could it? There would certainly be no meaning for this change of function of some of the parts of a given system; because selection only keeps stuff that works; and this initial mutation (the first step) leaves us with something that does not work! Or should we wish for a great number of successive mutations that come – all by chance - to do the desired job (desired by *nobody* of course!) fast before the species becomes extinct? Or should we expect the desired changes to come all in one happy leap of "random" mutation for the entire body to be restructured in favor of the new organ or part? Of course you have to be reminded that there is no previous plan, purpose or intent in Darwinian mechanisms whatsoever!

Thus we conclude that there is no way that this "evolution" of a system with a new function, from an older system with a different function, could possibly take place gradually! It either happens in one amazing leap (as in creation and previous determinate plan), or it doesn't happen at all!

All you have to do as a sane human being – really - is to properly understand the basic rational concepts underneath a given theory or statement in order to make good judgment of whether or not it is worth taking to the lab in the first place![35]

[35] Let me make it clear – one more time - to my atheist reader that I am not a creationist and I am not in the business of making up a new 'theory' for biology! My argumentation is purely philosophical, and my discussion of the concept of irreducibility is only intended to demonstrate to the atheist – by more than one argument – that no matter what he does, and whatever plot he resorts to in explaining the steps of his evolutionary story, he cannot escape the necessity of there being a purposeful agent of some sort with a

This is why it is wrong and unacceptable - by the way - for professional biologists to be bothered by people from different scientific disciplines, sometimes not even scientific at all, for so easily barging into their theories and criticizing them as they do! If judging the theory demands particular knowledge of biology then certainly it is not allowable for people other than biologists to make a judgment on that theory! However, this is not the case with the core tenets of Darwin's theory! It clashes with A-priori axiomatic reasoning! So non-biologist debaters certainly need nothing more than possess a proper understanding of the rationale of Darwinism and natural selection to effectively enter the debate! They do not need to have a certificate in biology before they could judge the fundamental aspects of the Darwinian proposition! They are discussing basic rationality here (philosophy you may say); not how to get a reading from a radiometric dating device, or how to identify a given fossil!

And if evolutionists cannot have those people convinced with the rationality of the very core of their position with simple arguments; then they should not bother trying to convince them that they all should let go of their religions for the sake of Darwin's theory! It really doesn't take a rocket scientist to understand the basic mechanisms of Darwinian evolution, and the false reasoning it applies!

Whenever a layperson (in Biology) says in response to Darwinism: *"This must be wrong, I cannot find any good reason why I should not believe this magnificence and perfectness in nature to have been created by a perfect creator"*, he is really blowing evolutionism away at first shot; and that's really all the argument any sane man has to put against it! Because no matter how much evolution or Biology he learns, he will never find that good reason, good enough for him to let go of his natural logic and intuition in such a twisted way; in fact the more he learns about nature and living things the more convinced he will be that this creation is perfect; and thus the higher he will naturally think of its creator! Evolutionism – as he will realize - asks him to go against his natural stream of reason, to run it in absolute

previously determined plan somewhere, for everything to fall 'in place' in due time and to work properly in a collective equilibrium.

reverse! I am, of course, speaking of a lay-person whose natural sense of things has not been depleted or reversed by Darwinism!

At conception level, the core idea is clear enough for any sane man to refute; no science certificate required here! Just as it is the case that you need not acquire a PHD in theology to see how fundamentally corrupt the concept of the Trinity – for example – clearly is! In fact it is orders of magnitude more corrupt – rationally – than the basic philosophies of all other doctrines of faith that we know today! However, like every preacher of irrational faith, they would easily argue: "You people don't understand it" or "You know nothing about evolution"! So typical indeed!

So again; it is against the core mechanism of evolution that the biological change from a certain "function (A)" system to a new "function (B)" system would take place in gradual (or simultaneous) steps of random mutation! "**Gradual" by definition cannot be random!** 'Gradual' can only describe steps taken on a predetermined path! This is why no matter what examples Darwinians resort to in explaining the difference between natural selection and chance (like the example of a random code generator), they can never escape the rational necessity of a previously determined order of some sort! This is why we argue – with no regards to whatever they may call 'scientific evidence' - that it is against the very meaning of random or chance – as used by Darwinians in evolutionary discourse - that there should be "steps" or "gradual" or "simultaneous"!

The model of evolution of a certain system through the advent of new parts in it for the sake of better performing the same overall function of the system (like the alleged evolution of the eye or the wing); this model cannot take place in gradual evolutionary steps, or else the organ will fail entirely! A few mutations that are only a few steps in the way of changing a simple eye into a compound eye, will leave the eye functionless, until all the steps are complete; which should actually mean total failure of the organ in doing even its old function! We have to get a single set of mutations that adds a new part, and at the same time has the specific job of all the other parts of the organ redefined (which means to have them all work in a rather different way at cellular and molecular level), which means an unimaginable number

of **simultaneous "random"** mutations in different parts, for the sake of accommodating the new part and working with it properly! This redefinition should at least preserve the original function of the organ throughout its transformation into a more complex organ by means of those alterations and additions of new parts! The only other option is failure! I mean they don't suppose that when a new part (patch of cells) is added to an organism it will work as a (plug and play) device, do they?! Even "Plug and play" devices are specifically designed for this model of detachable performance!

So it turns out that very much indeed is demanded from "random" mutation, far too much for any reasonable man to find the word "random" to really do any good describing it (I use the Darwinian terminology of random here, not the actual (eye-of-the-beholder) meaning that it should have, as we elaborated in an earlier section of this book)!

What "selection" then are we talking about, when we cannot imagine a number of species surviving through a few generations lacking a certain function, when it is evident that without this function they cannot have survived, bred, speciated, or co-existed in balance all across this cosmic time span? For a gradation of genetic changes to keep natural life up and running, well adapted and in perfect balance (as a whole) with every changing aspect of nature, the way we say it **must** have been, and for every favorable change to come along before the entire system crashes, and the balance fails irreversibly; it takes a model of constantly and perfectly determinate control, not a "series" of "steps" of "chance" where only that which happens to work by chance would survive! The system must have always had those strict binding rules.

What we've always been trying to tell them, and we hope they think about it someday, seriously, is that **there is no proper code of reason for any man to amalgamate within the very same process in its every step; process with non-process, perfectness with chaos, system with chance; steady long term mechanism with random instances and uncontrolled events, and attribute all that work – in origin – to no willful creator!** The pathetic position they seek to uphold between chance – as they ascribe it to certain natural processes rather than the human modeling of those processes

– and creation, only gives us a creator who runs a system of random generation! All they are actually doing do here is model a lousy process of creation, rather than acknowledge perfection thereof! Darwinians in fact believe in a blind creator; and this is all that Darwinism boils down to, no matter what they do!

I quote:

> *"A lot more work needs to be done, of course, and I'm sure it will be. Such work would never be done if scientists were satisfied with a lazy default such as 'intelligent design theory' would encourage." (The Delusion p.132)*

What "lazy default"? I'm sorry but if you people are only looking for something "interesting" to keep you busy, then by all means go have fun somewhere else!

It is wisdom to know what you're aiming at, and to have a clear answer to the "why" before the "how"! A lot of work needs to be done on **what** exactly, and for what end? Yes of course a lot of research in natural sciences still needs to be done to further expand human knowledge, but for what end and in what fields? Wise people do not do science for science, or for the fun of it, or just so they find something to do! Atheists on the other hand have already chosen not to know the purpose of their being on this Earth! So the question of purpose is to them an entirely ridiculous proposition! They do science because they have fun doing it! Because it makes them feel better! Because it would be "lazy" not to, or because it would be "stupid"! They use this absolution in their position towards everything they like to do, regardless of whether or not they could justify it properly!

A wise man on the other hand, knows his ultimate purpose, and the specific objective of every single thing that he does, in the light of this purpose! People who know the heavenly truth from the creator, stand in the middle between two extremes: an extreme that holds it a necessity and a must that humans put all their resources in researching every single idea that could possibly come across a man's mind, regardless of the rationality or the justifiability of its meaning and purpose, and another extreme that shuts it all

off, and closes the gates of research and empirical experimentation altogether! Wisdom has it that only a purpose of research that positively (and evidently) benefits people should be put to the claim! But that which does not, or that which would evidently harm them, should certainly be prohibited (not just abolished)!

Imagine a man who chooses to design a huge machine that – for example – does nothing more than scratch his back! This is stupidity! The purpose itself is stupid! Yes he may do wonders of innovation in the way the scratching device works; but in the end, no matter how sophisticated it may be; it remains to be a total waste and a fool's work, because even something as simple as a wooden stick would suffice to do the job!

I remember one day, when I was a student at High school, my math teacher challenged me and a couple of other students to solve a problem in calculus, and said that whoever solves it first will be given a reward. We took it home, and I remember I spent about three hours trying to work it out, squeezing my head, approaching it from every end, and I practiced every trick in mathematics I could possibly think of at the time, and ended up writing a solution that spanned three long pages! It was unbelievably complex that I can almost swear that even the designer of the problem itself couldn't possibly imagine such a solution! I had all the fun in the world solving it and was very proud of myself! I delivered it to the teacher the next day with an air of victory, and was shocked to find that he had given the reward to another student! When he explained the winning solution, it turned out to be as simple as a four or five steps operation! It was a single idea or trick, for which the problem was designed! I didn't capture that trick at first glance, so I took a very long way around! I was disappointed for the moment but then I realized that this is what mathematics is about: The shortest way to the query! I doubt that the teacher really bothered to go through the long and very complicated steps of the solution that I came up with, although it was indeed quite creative! Perhaps he thought I was bluffing and dismissed it at first impression as a joke or something!

When I remember this story now, I do not blame him! The purpose of the problem was not just to solve it in any possible way, but in the simplest way and the most relevant to the course learning outcome! And even though my solution was perfectly correct; only one solution fulfilled the learning outcome and particular purpose of the problem, and mine was not it!

The moral is; not every product of the human mind is to be appreciated or encouraged, based on how sophisticated, imaginative, or creative that product is! Not every research objective is to be supported and supplied with the resources it needs! Not every idea of a research is by necessity brilliant, not to mention: acceptable or **Justifiable**! Only a fool would stand in admiration of the technology of a tank that has come to take down his own house!

So when we say to Darwinians: “Stop! Your research objective is fundamentally false and unacceptable and is destructive to man” it is not “laziness” or “satisfaction with not knowing”! It is the wisdom of knowing how to make the right judgment of a research query, and how to put human and material resources in their perfectly right place!

Just look at this outrage:

> *“Here is the message that an imaginary 'intelligent design theorist' might broadcast to scientists: 'If you don't understand how something works, never mind: just give up and say God did it. You don't know how the nerve impulse works? Good! You don't understand how memories are laid down in the brain? Excellent! Is photosynthesis a bafflingly complex process? Wonderful! Please don't go to work on the problem, just give up, and appeal to God. Dear scientist, don't work on your mysteries. Bring us your mysteries, for we can use them. Don't squander precious ignorance by researching it away. We need those glorious gaps as a last refuge for God.' (The Delusion p.132)*

Now who on Earth is he trying to fool? Where in this world did you ever find a religious man who – regardless of his particular creed – would say: "*'If you don't understand how something works, never mind: just give up and say God did it"?* Could you – please – name just a single one?

Even if there is or was somebody whose false religion or his wrong understanding drives him against something that is evidently useful to mankind, then it is he who should be blamed, or his false religion in particular, not "religion"! The ignorance of a man is not an argument against knowledge itself!

We, followers of the true revelation of the creator, answer saying "The Lord did it" only in reply to the stupidity of those who say: "Natural selection did it"! We do not refrain from performing beneficial research and development because "God did it"! We do not tell people not to do science because "God did it"! We most certainly do **not** tell them to be satisfied with "ignorance" because "God did it"! And we are not to be blamed for the historical crimes of other corrupted doctrines of faith that once took authority over Europe, and enforced dark fallacious rulings in the name of the Lord, may He be praised! We are not to be blamed for the corruption of a comment by Saint Augustine, when he says, as quoted by the author:

> *"There is another form of temptation, even more fraught with danger. This is the disease of curiosity. It is this which drives us to try and discover the secrets of nature, those secrets which are beyond our understanding, which can avail us nothing and which man should not wish to learn'*

We, Muslims, have nothing to do with the way Dawkins understands this statement! Nothing at all! Even if ever a Muslim scholar expressed such a meaning as understood by the professor, it is not to be taken for argument against Islam because it cannot be derived from any of the four sources of revelation and legislation in Islam (Qur'an, Sunnah, Ijma', and "quias")! Actually even Christians would tell you they have nothing to do with this understanding he derives from the quotation!

Muslims are people whose holy scripture tells them:

((…Say (O Muhammad): Is the blind man equal to the seer, or is darkness equal to light?...)) Translation of meanings of the Qur'an (13|16)

((…Ask people of knowledge if you know not)) Translation of meanings of the Qur'an (16|43)

((It is He who appointed the sun a splendor (luminance) and the moon a light (reflection), and determined its stages, such that ye could learn the number of the years, and learn calculation. Allah created all that in none but truth. He details the revelations for people who have knowledge.)) Translation of the meanings of the Qur'an (10|5)

((…Allah will exalt those who believe among you, and those who have knowledge, to high ranks. Allah is aware of what ye do.)) Translation of the Qur'an (58|11) (knowledge in this verse is primarily knowledge of the Lord, and all other forms of useful knowledge follow in graded ranks)

It is a subject of absolute consensus (Ijma') among scholars of all ages in Islam, based on more general texts, that we should seek everything that yields benefit in this life and in the hereafter (both on an individual scale, and on a collective scale). This includes the claim of every beneficial knowledge to man, which is **adequately obligatory** to the society, (Fard kefaya فرض كفاية) such that when there is no sufficiency in those who work in a certain field that is necessary for Muslims, then the entire nation is to be charged with *sin*! This is what the ruling (Fard kefaya) means in Islam; it is any obligatory act which if done with adequacy by the least amount of competent people who could do it as demanded, then the rest of the nation is free from obligation and blame, but if not, not! I must add that absolute consensus of scholars in Islam (Ijma') is a source of legislation; based on scriptural evidence we have no room to discuss here.

So as you can see, my reader, in the true revelation of the creator, seeking beneficial knowledge in general is not inhibited! It is not even optional to Muslims; it is in fact **mandatory**! And the manner of its obligation over Muslims is indeed a perfect legislation that cannot be laid down by a man! Had it been a man who made up the Sharee'a law from his own mind, he would have made all pursuits of knowledge mandatory for every Muslim, or

optional for every Muslim; or he would've neglected it altogether! He would have spoilt the extremely delicate balance between the welfare of the individual and that of the community, but this is not the case at all!

The creator knows that not all men could qualify to specialize in every field, and that humans vary by necessity in their mental powers, and their natural talents and faculties, and they cannot shift their fields of specialty repeatedly, or specialize in a multitude of delicate fields at the same time! So this obligation cannot be laid down equally upon every individual for every desired practice! On the other hand, had it been only favorable, there would be no guarantee that sufficient amount of experts would specialize in the desired field of knowledge and suffice for the necessity as it comes!

So the law in this way guarantees that whenever there is necessity or need, the nation would understand that there is a collective responsibility of obligation to suffice for the demand and work for it, and the ruler should see that it is fulfilled! [36]

A nation governed by the law of Islam (sharee'a) is a nation that has a **religious obligation, a religious duty, to seek knowledge**, and to produce – in wisdom and purposefulness – as many scientists and experts as demanded in every field of human practice that is necessary for the nation's welfare and prosperity. Tell me now, what other religion or system on Earth do you know, places knowledge – all forms of evidently beneficiary knowledge – at such a rank?

As for the Aquinas quotation, this understanding by Dawkins is clearly not what it means! The man is obviously talking about the claim of knowledge that is **beyond** human understanding, that is, beyond the very ability of man to understand! The problem with atheists is that they do not accept the fact that there are things that do go beyond the ability of man to imagine or

[36] And of course, keeping in regard a corner stone of Sharee'a that Allah only assigns a man to that which he **can** do, and he is not to be charged with something he could not do, we say that without a precise vision by the ruler of a Muslim nation of the real demands of Muslims in every particular field of practice of sciences and crafts, and thus with our current incapability of deciding upon that as a nation (or many nations), we are currently free from deserving punishment provided that we never quit doing what we can for the sake of better upholding such collective responsibilities in the future, working for that which is better. Only the ruler in this case would deserve the heavenly blame for not taking up his responsibility in this concern.

analogize! Ask any atheist if he knows any plausible way to describe whatever is out there beyond the universe (or beyond mathematical infinity)! For instance, the concept of **how** the Lord is, or how He does what He does, is by necessity of reason beyond the human ability to imagine or analogize, pretty much so like the necessity of His very existence itself!

So healthy humans do realize that there is – by necessity – much that they should not be capable of comprehending and much that they could not find out on their own as humans (and hence should not waste their time and resources seeking to obtain it the way they do)! They do realize that there are questions that cannot be answered by means of analogy or by any other means that the human mind works with, so no matter how advanced man could one day become, they will always be unanswerable by those methods! It is not a crime to have people satisfied with learning their limits and placing their abilities on the right track and purpose; it is by all means a virtue!

So yes you do have a limit, and there is indeed – by necessity of reason - knowledge that no man can or will ever obtain!

- There is knowledge that cannot be obtained by man at all, and he needs not obtain it for his life on Earth, or for the purpose of his creation. (like the knowledge of how the Lord is; The way His attributes are and the way they work, for example)
- And knowledge that cannot be obtained by man on his own, through reasoning or observation (empirical science, or philosophy), but is at the same time essential for man to learn nonetheless, and can only be delivered to mankind from the creator Himself. (like the question of origins, the question of purpose, the question of death and the afterlife and so forth)

This is what separates those who know wisdom from those who don't. Those who know wisdom, will know their limits and their end goals and will know that as long as the query of research is justifiable by the source from which that ultimate goal along with all ethics of knowledge is taken, and does not contradict with a rational necessity (claiming something that is rationally

impossible for man), or violate a basic teaching of the true heavenly revelation; then it is as favorable and positively commended as can be! They will know what questions are to be asked in a laboratory and why, and what questions are to be asked somewhere else and where, and what questions are not to be asked at all! The wisest of all are those who know their limits!

The professor then proceeds to make an argument from the events of the trial known as (the Kitzmiller-Dover trial), picking on the position that Behe took regarding the peer-reviewed publications that he was presented on the trial in response to his claim that science will never find an evolutionary explanation to the immune system. Well, I can easily dismiss this argument altogether simply by saying that Behe was indeed wrong in this claim! He shouldn't have said that!

There is indeed no limit to the number of imaginative "explanations" one can come up with that could be added to the mythical story of "evolution" one way or another! The theory tells the story of ancestral lineages to currently existing beings or organic systems, and simply places systems (both existent and fossilized) that may look proximal in shape, function or structure, together in a long storyline that is claimed to be an historical line of heredity that started off from the simplest system of them all and ended at the most complex we currently know of! Now when you think of it, this is not – at all – a proposition that we could find difficulty stretching and applying to every system in life (which is exactly what Darwinians are very good at doing)! Yet none of this **proves it to be the truth**, or gives it any proper justification whatsoever for the way it reverses the very polarity of human reason! The Darwinian objection to this very simple and reasonable claim by Behe here under the name of "science" is a perfectly clear example!

Imagine that one day, you found two photos buried underground of two individuals that look pretty much alike! Now, you may easily claim that they must be family; they must be twins or something, then you would start gathering what you think could be taken as evidence to support your theory

(or to dismiss it)! That – by far – is fine by me. But what would it make of you if even though I could easily prove to you – irrefutably - that they were totally unrelated, and that the two photos came to this place from two absolutely distinct places, or I can prove to you that they are both fake, or even that they are two photos of the same individual!; what would it make of you if you still insisted on adding further "explanations" from here and there that would accord with your hypothesis, taking them for "Evidence"? That's what it makes of you: A blind believer who can't see himself waking up from a dream that he favors so much, he cannot imagine letting go of it!

I couldn't care less what Dr. Behe said or did on that particular event! His personal misjudgments or anybody else's on this or any other matter, are **not** evidence against creation! The philosophical concept he seeks to prove should not be put to the test of 'science' in the first place! Actually when you listen to the statement by Rothschild in comment on Behe's attitude, it is indeed no more than a cheap appeal to emotions of the Jury! He says (as quoted by Dawkins):

> *"Thankfully, there are scientists who do search for answers to the question of the origin of the immune system . . . It's our defense against debilitating and fatal diseases. The scientists who wrote those books and articles toil in obscurity, without book royalties or speaking engagements. Their efforts help us combat and cure serious medical conditions. By contrast, Professor Behe and the entire intelligent design movement are doing nothing to advance scientific or medical knowledge and are telling future generations of scientists, don't bother." (The Delusion p.133)*

What does the general meaning of learning about immune systems and how to deal with them in medical and genetic treatments, have to do with deciding on their "Darwinian origins"? Any sane man should see that the two queries of research are not relevant (philosophically), and that they are only made relevant by the convictions and beliefs of atheist scientists! Nobody is denying them merit for discovering what they do know about those systems; but their faith in the origins from which those systems came from is something we do not accept! It is a claim of knowledge that is by

nature out of their empirical reach, and we do not care what they believe about it! So what this man is saying is simply this: "*Oh people bow and pay homage to those scientists who serve you well and supply you with answers along with medicine, and do not listen to anybody who wishes to falsify a single one of their claims for whatever reason! Those are evil people who added nothing to medical knowledge and who do not even want you to progress in science!*"

Now what kind of an argument is this? Is this really worth the quotation? Well, to Dawkins it is of course!

He concludes this part by claiming that there are "flaws" in the way certain forms of life are composed! He mentions liability to certain forms of disease, in an argument that goes in line with the way they would explain the fact that certain individuals are born with disabilities or defects every now and then! They claim it all to be exactly what would be expected if natural life progressed through "evolution" not "Design"!

I say this is argument from sheer ignorance! Because as I stated in an earlier section, in order to properly judge the perfectness of a certain given system (which is obviously perfect with – and maybe even because of – all those things you hate in it), you have to fully understand its purpose of making beforehand! And you cannot possibly obtain that knowledge from any other source but from the maker of the system himself! So what the professor and every other atheist know not (or rather insist on neglecting), is that in the knowledge that is evidently delivered to us from the creator Himself, we do learn the purpose of the making of this life, the purpose of the making of disease, pain, defection, and the exact purpose why the world has to be exactly the way that it is! We know why there has to be mutations and disabilities in this way that those people would claim – in their ignorance and utter irrationality – it proves the system to have been founded on random events and "natural selection" rather than creation!

If it were indeed the case that God meant for the world to be a paradise where nobody suffers or gets sick, nobody dies, nothing decays or decomposes, and we all live in eternal bliss as a single happy family; then I

would totally agree with your claim that this is not how you expect a purposefully and perfectly created world to be! But how on earth do **you** know that? How do you know what God meant for the world and what His exact purpose of creation was?

He claims that the fact that the recurrent laryngeal nerve takes a mysteriously long detour on its way to its destination; proves this to be a **waste** and the remainder of an incomplete evolution from an ancestral life form!

Now I find no shame in admitting that I do not currently know why this nerve has to be that long and take such a strange path to its destination! We may or may not find that out through further research, and I would certainly do endorse such a research if I knew it would help in the purpose of developing medical sciences that would help us cure diseases (not for the purpose of supplying "evidence" for or against Darwinism!). However, my position of justifiable certainty is that our current ignorance of the exact function of this particular structure of the nerve, does not by any means give any man the right to claim that this is a "waste" or the remainder of a process of evolution that should have gone better!

This is indeed another Darwinian attempt to use gaps of current human knowledge in favor of their theory! It is them, planting their own god (Darwinian chaos) in those gaps in the most arrogant and irrational manner of all! And when the time comes and better knowledge is revealed to us of why this nerve has to be exactly the way that it is; they would retreat with their pathetic god of insolence to another gap in human knowledge, the way they claim followers of religion to be doing! Had this nerve been badly created, with any excess or waste as they claim, it wouldn't have functioned as perfectly as no one can dare deny that it does! But what should anybody do to make them see that?

The same is to be said of other examples that he gives for what he views to be "errors of evolution"! Just listen to this statement:

> *"Many of our human ailments, from lower back pain to hernias, prolapsed uteruses and our susceptibility to sinus infections, result*

> *directly from the fact that we now walk upright with a body that was shaped over hundreds of millions of years to walk on all fours." (The Delusion p.134)*

Another argument from blind faith indeed!

One cannot escape wondering, why, in the religion of Darwin, did man ever have to become upright at all?! What evolutionary necessity could possibly have man evolve into walking upright; what "survival privilege" do humans have over apes because of the upright structure of their bodies? Obviously none at all!

Well, maybe somewhere in some of their textbooks you will find a researcher proposing an evolutionary scenario of some sort to "explain" it! Another twisted Darwinian fiction, that is. Or when they run dry on imagination, they would just resort to random mutation: It just happened by chance! You know how the story goes!

My concern here, however, is in his extremely arrogant and clearly false claim that the human body is defected, (imperfect)!

Well let's start where every sane researcher should start; by defining terminology! What is a defect and what is an imperfectness?

A defect is by definition a failure to comply with the exact function or purpose for which a particular system is made! This failure may be anything from a minor error to total failure! So how do you know that people who get back pain are not **meant by their creator** to have this pain for a particular purpose that is part of what their bodies are made for?

It is interesting how under the very tag of evolution itself, Darwinian researchers have come up with a new discipline that they call "Evolutionary medicine" where they are actually examining many diseases and physical symptoms that though they would still view as "imperfectness" they find to be amazing survival necessities and mechanisms **as they are**! An archetypal example indeed of human stubbornness and presumptuous denial! You can see in the very language they use, the unbelievably deep contradiction and inverse-reason in their explanations!

As much as you hate to cough, for example, and it troubles you and maybe even pains you, you have to do it because it does good things to your body (least of which is alarm you to the danger)! And so they claim that this is why natural selection kept this “imperfectness”, and this is not how a human designer would get around with design! I ask: Now that they understand its perfectly balanced function, how dare they call it a “defect” or “imperfection”?

Well, yes indeed this is **not** how a human designer would create a system; that an *annoyance* and source of *trouble* of this sort would actually be made into a necessary component of the very way the system works; but we keep telling them: **whoever** said that we believe in a **human** designer who made natural life or the entire Universe?

Neither the ways are analogous, nor the purpose itself! The purpose of creation of our bodies, and every subsystem in them, is clearly not analogous to the purpose for which any human creator would create any artifact of any sort! We humans create out of need, we need what we create to serve us, so the prospect of creating an artifact with a deliberately designed mechanism of noise or self damage and decay that is in itself a necessary subsystem for the artifact to work properly, this is not something we – humans - would do; and certainly not in such an outstanding perfectness! This is obviously a system that is perfectly prepared for a purpose that is far more than just “surviving” or “breeding”! A purpose that should have those negative agents serving it just as good as the positive ones! This is how it is made perfect!

This is obviously not the way things are in biological systems alone; it’s the way the whole world is! It’s the way of the universe at large! Earthquakes, volcanoes, hurricanes, thunderstorms, floods, and all other forms of natural catastrophes, do hit life on earth, and inflict damage (system decomposition) to parts of it; however, scientists have no choice but to admit the sheer necessity of the occurrence of such catastrophes the way they do, for the welfare and continuity of nature and life itself on Earth! There is no escaping this duality of poles: The positive and the negative, and the perfect balance between them on all levels in this magnificent system. Thus there is no way in the world any of these negative agents could be called an

"imperfectness"! How could it possibly be imperfectness, when the system cannot work without it? There is no way this world and the life in it could be made to do without those disasters, those tragedies that we hate and fear so much! Without death, life on Earth will fail! Without decay, there shall be no composition! Newborn specimens are composed of the very same matter that is left behind by the dead, and fed into the living through nutrition! Without those subsystems 'failing', there shall be no life on Earth! This is quite obviously how it is built! It's how it works.

A masterful system indeed, perfectly organized to be in the exact way that it is! So instead of denying the extremely obvious, atheists should be asking themselves: Why is it created in this particular way? Why does there have to be pain, suffering, disaster, and death? What's the point of all so many things that we hate in the world? And where could we obtain the only true, verifiably true answer to this question? Well, first they have to admit that it is not a question that natural sciences could answer! Higher meaning, first order cause and purpose, can only be known by direct teaching from the creator Himself! The purpose **does** indeed include and perfectly justify all those negative aspects that atheists would whine about, and call "imperfectnesss"! Holders of the beacon of heavenly knowledge, true heavenly knowledge, never claimed that we humans come to this world to live in absolute happiness! Absolutely not! Our knowledge as Muslims goes in perfect accord with the way the world is created! We simply know what this is all about!

Now this idea of a system that works on destruction as well as on construction, in every single part and on every level of it, is high above our limited creative powers as humans! And it is – as such – just the way you would expect of a system that is perfectly created for the purpose of testing humans for choice of faith and deeds, the way the Lord teaches.

We, human designers, would not work our way with design of a manmade system in such a way that a clearly dangerous and corruptive agent that if left unchecked may actually damage the entire system, would be made of such an immense functional importance and value to that system! We wouldn't place a built-in virus in a computer, keep it balanced or

quarantined by antivirus software, and in the mean time, give that virus itself an important function in preservation of the system; knowing that if ever it happened that the antiviral agent was to crash, the computer would fail! I mean, unless we needed that virus there for a particular end, we wouldn't choose to do that! And we wouldn't need it there because our purpose of designing a computer does not include the option of its deliberate damage! We will never choose to damage that machine on purpose! And if we wished to do that, we will never bother giving the damaging agent a stabilizing function in the design! It will just be a self destructive mechanism that remains "off" until it is chosen to run and only then is it to be turned on! We cannot design a machine that works in such a perfectly delicate balance between negative forces that have the capacity to ravage it, and positive ones that hold them back, while each of the two forces has a set of positive functions of its own that has to be fulfilled for the sake of the general purpose of the system!

It's an interesting point to make in this context; that if what we have today is only the lucky remainder of a very long history of billions of failing species and failing generations that were not selected because they lacked survival equipment – or internal balance - and waited to no avail for the lucky mutation to come about; chances are we should be stumbling upon such "unfit" unselected freaks of nature in fossil findings much more frequently than those "selected" fossils that we have! No such a thing was ever found though; we don't see it today and there's no way anybody can prove it ever took place any time in the past either!

Total and utter wishful thinking, that's all they have!

They would say that natural selection did not develop those balancing agents, turning a defect into a benefit, it cannot do that! It was random mutation that did it, and had it not done it, natural selection would have driven the poor species to extinction because of that defect! Well, the word "**perfect**" doesn't even begin to describe what this "**random**" mutation is claimed to have "done"!

Look at the way a pregnant woman carries her baby. Scientists discovered recently that a woman is capable of doing this without this serious change in the gravitational center of her body damaging her ability to walk steadily, or causing her to topple over, because of certain features in the base of her spine and her hip joints that help her twist backwards for better balance as she walks without damaging her back! It is an adaptive feature that is found only in bipedal females. The question to the evolutionist now is this: had this biological feature not been there in women exclusively ever since they started walking on two rather than four (!); how possibly could the human race survive? You can easily imagine what the fate of the species would be if pregnancy at any point in history had a damaging effect to a female or would cripple her body! Obviously, if Darwinian evolution was true, then women had to have this feature developed in them **prior** to breeding as a bipedal organism; otherwise bipedalism would not be selected! So are we again reducing the story to another unbelievably lucky mutation that – for no survival necessity at all - enabled women to move on two rather than on four, and walk steadily with that load in their bellies?

Thus we ask: how possibly could this feature be **selected** for humans? Why did this feature prevail, along with this essential change in the female spine? Why do we not see any species of humans (like species of apes) walking on four today? No "evolutionary" justification whatsoever there!

It is thus unthinkable that those Harvard researchers who recently published this discovery – the special features in female spine - in "Nature" magazine would still term it: an "evolutionary trick"! This is badly written fiction indeed! It's just like every follower of a false religion would do! He would easily twist every amazing discovery that any researcher makes giving it an "explanation" that accords with his beliefs; and would take that for a plausible explanation no matter how senseless and irrational it may actually be! And when accused of that, the atheist would make the famous complaint that his opponents are anti-science and do not wish to have this gap filled with "science"! What Science?

To sum up I say; **A fundamentally essential element in a certain system cannot be considered a flaw of design, and as long as the normal**

condition is not one which has the negative effect of that element up and running all the time, but has it under a perfect balance in keeping with its purpose; we are clearly speaking of perfectness of creation! So again, instead of claiming this to be a defect that "Natural selection" could not *get around*, we should rather ask ourselves: Why did the creator choose to create things in this particular way!

And the answer is simply because we are here to be **tested** for choice. Tested by the good as well as the bad! Part of this test is of course, infliction with different sorts of troubles, diseases, and malfunctions! Translation (2|155): ***((And surely We shall try (test) you with something of fear and hunger, and loss of wealth and lives and crops; but give glad tidings to the steadfast))***

This test not only justifies the way the world is, it justifies the way we are, the way we seek justice and righteousness, the reason there is such a thing as morality, the reason there is responsibility and accountability, we are here to choose to do right, and to be judged for it all!

The point I'm making here is that life is not to be justified by what **those people wish it to be**, but by what **its creator made it for**! The purpose of a system only comes from the maker of that system, not from a user who just opened his eyes one day to find himself using it as it is! This is the actual reason for the quarrel between us and Darwinians or holders of materialistic philosophies in general! They seek to deny creation so they could decide on the purpose of life and the reason why it is the way it is, all on their own; so they could make up whatever lie (philosophy) they wish to make and live by whatever rules they choose, and not stand accountable for any of their choices after their lifetimes are consumed! They know very well what it means to admit creation! It means direct and instant submission to the will of the creator and they just cannot see themselves do it!

Well, like it or not; it is the truth! You are obviously not in this world to live in perfect happiness, and the more you work for pleasure the more pain you get! And though you find it in you that you have the capacity to imagine a place where there is no bad, no evil, no pain, no death, and you'd certainly

love to go to it; you contrast that image to the way you observe the world around you, and find it to be very distinct, very distinct indeed! Bad and evil are overwhelmingly fundamental elements in the very fabric of this world, not occasional failures of a place that was originally designed to be a paradise!

Calamity is a fundamental, definitive, component of what this life is made for! If He so willed He could've easily made it into a perfectly positive system all the way, but that's not how it is built! That's not how it works for its purpose! There has to be a struggle! Now unsurprisingly, while Darwinians do realize this amazing property of the system; instead of using it as an example of how perfect this creation really is - given that its perfectness is something that goes without any effort to see and detect - they would ride their vehicles in the exact opposite direction and claim it to be a sign of "imperfectness"!

There is evidently always a positive system and a negative system that have to be in perfect balance in the human body in normal condition all the time, otherwise man would become sick! And when he is meant by his creator to get sick, his balance is determinately breached! It is caused to fail! Whereas the system – at large - is made in such a way that it balances and absorbs this "failure"! Thus it is wrong to even call it a failure in such an absolution! It is only a failure **relative** to the individual element that suffers the decay or the malfunction, in biological and physical terms. But as for the purpose of creation of the system as a whole, it is perfectly justified, it is doing just what it was made to do, and the human individual who suffers this physical failure may indeed make those choices that would have him pass the test and get all good out of that negative experience!

The way we move, the way we live is made in such a way that normally we would not suffer because of the way our backs are formed (for example)! Each one of the two "poles" of the process is made as such for obviously very good reasons, and we do perfectly with both poles in constant balance! Yes indeed this perfect balance could easily be shifted – purposefully so I should say – so that a particular individual would suffer back pain under the will of His creator! But this is not evidence against creation! If anything, it is

in fact evidence for the exact purpose that the creator teaches about His creation! Had he willed to spare humans the possibility of ever coming to suffer back pain, things would've been much different in that spine, and in the whole world for that matter! But every single element in our bodies – as in the rest of the system - has this amazing property built in, precisely because it was not made to run this way forever! **What we hold is that this is exactly how it is created, and purposefully so!**

So fact of the matter is, this 'back-pain conducive' structure is by all means perfectness of creation, not the outcome of an incomplete evolution from a quadrupedal bone structure!

Now, Dawkins concludes this part of his book with a sarcastic comment that I really should not waste printing ink commenting on; however, it is an icon as to how superficial an atheist's take on the idea of "God" is!

He says:

> *"Predators seem beautifully 'designed' to catch prey animals, while the prey animals seem equally beautifully 'designed' to escape them. Whose side is God on"*

I say, had you not been drenched up to your nose in "fairy tale" stories and pagan mythologies of false gods, and had that not been all that you know about "religion"; you would've never made such a silly remark!

The creator obviously created animals to be just the way they are! Perfect balance between preying and breeding; perfect balance between the skills and powers of the predator on one side, and the abilities of the prey to escape and camouflage on the other, not to mention the perfect accord with external natural conditions! This is no "cruelty"! Man has always been intimidated by the sight of a hungry predator beast ravishing its prey! Yes indeed it is violent and bitter, and naturally this is how it feels in all species that come at a low level in the food chain. But don't we all have our own dangers and threats to deal with and our different ways to survive them?

Obviously the least amount of knowledge that this animal that you sympathize with has about itself and about its place in nature, is that it is

food for this particular predator, and that it should have no bigger concern in this life – after worshipping the creator in its own way - than making sure not to end up as its dinner! Eat and avoid being eaten; they do accept that code of living on this Earth, they do it as best as they could, they don't find it unfair, and you most certainly have no route of knowledge to prove otherwise!

In the Qur'an we are taught that all animals (all species that move around: Dawab دواب) are nations (peoples) like mankind!

Allah says (translation of the meanings of the verse): (6|38): ***((There is not an animal in the Earth, nor a flying creature flying on two wings, that is not of "peoples" (nations) like unto you. We have neglected nothing in the Book (of Our decrees). Then unto their Lord they will all be gathered.))***

They do have intelligence, proper reasoning, and languages of their own! They do have systems of order, tribal order, and they know how to do what they are here to do! You'd think that science has advanced far enough for people to actually see clear signs of this meaning in the way that animals live and communicate! Yet, they don't! This is because of a fundamentally wrong approach to understanding how animals reason and communicate, and of course "judging" them: The accursed Darwinian approach!

Animals do have reason, languages of their own (to us they are seen to be nothing more than a number of unexplainable noises and gestures, just as our languages would appear to be to them), that are in full accordance both mentally and physically with the purpose of their existence, just as it is the case with us. So it is ultimately wrong to claim that man is more intelligent than other living species in any way; the features and purposes of human intelligence do not by any means compare to those of animal intelligence in other species.

A Darwinian would easily think that since he cannot communicate with other creatures, and cannot comprehend their means of communication, then they must be incapable of practicing the same forms of communication amongst themselves in ways that suit them! He would easily claim that man is the most "evolved" species in terms of intelligence, language and verbal

communication! **The definition man holds in his book of knowledge for the term intelligence is a definition that is built entirely on a human datum (frame of reference), related to human problems and human ways, so it is ultimately wrong to apply that very same definition upon other living beings.** The fact that we cannot talk to birds or monkeys or that they cannot respond (on the human datum of response) to human conduct and speech does not by any means suggest that they are void of the property of knowledge, completely expressive language or intelligence, or even that they are lacking therein.

If intelligence is loosely defined as the way the mind of a creature deals with different situations in which the creature is put, it is through the creature's body structure that this way is executed, and it is within the nature of the function (purpose) of being for that creature on earth that this execution is justified and performed. This means that, intelligence of a bird for example is measured fairly when the bird's behavior is compared to that of other birds of its kind and of the same species, not to our human patterns of interaction, response or behavior. Definitely the challenges and problems that we face in our human life are not equal to those that a bird faces! Same goes for apes and all other species!

Yet Darwinism has spoilt this very clear datum, (along with everything else that it inverted really!) and turned all life forms into steps on a stair of evolution; placing human means of communication, mentality and reason, as datum for understanding and judging the corresponding features in every living being, and the way they should be when they have fully evolved! You say we are more intelligent than a monkey because for example we found that we cannot manage to teach a monkey to talk like we do or read and write like we do? Whoever said that a monkey *should* be capable of developing those skills or learning to do them in the first place? Other than Darwinians who believe they are only a species of evolved apes, I don't know anyone else who could find any proper justification for such an approach. There are absolutely no common grounds between man and ape in terms of purpose that would justify our judgment of their intelligence in reference to our human standards of intellect, the way they do, and would

give us the right to call them less "evolved" in terms of reasoning and language.

Yes indeed we humans come at the top of all living beings in terms of physical sophistication, regarding the purpose for which we were made and the honoring that Allah bestowed upon our father. Translation of the Quran (95|4): ***((Surely We created man of the best stature)).*** However this doesn't make humans more *evolved* and it certainly doesn't give us the right to judge those creatures according to our datum of purpose and our physical and mental faculties!

This is indeed a major error of reasoning that is - as we have elaborated repeatedly in this literature - a fundamental problem with the philosophy of Darwinian science. **Do not judge a machine by the purpose and performance of another machine, and without obtaining the blueprint of the machine you judge!** We have no right to say that a fridge is for example less "evolved" or "advanced" than a laptop computer! Yes the technology in the latter is indeed far more advanced – with respect to the history of human development with industrial technology – but those are two different artifacts that are not to be judged in terms of the way they both serve their own distinct functions, by comparing them to one another!

This is wrong!

Thanks to Darwin, the term intelligence has always been used ever since, according to the human reference of what intelligence is in man, to judge all other creatures as inferior to man in terms of evolution (mentally). It makes no sense as we have seen to take human intelligence as a datum to classify and measure intelligence of other species, because none of them has the same function or purpose in life, or the same tools, not to mention the purpose and tools of man.

Human intelligence is not the datum for anything but for judging individual levels of human intelligence. Each species has a perfectly consistent role to play, and every creature knows exactly what it is supposed to do (evolutionist humans not included of course!). Survival is thus not for the fittest; survival is for those whose purpose of being on Earth continues to be.

As long as a species still has a role to play on this planet, it is kept existent, and this is how Allah preserves this perfect harmony of existence on Earth, all out of high heavenly wisdom and within a perfect unbreakable order. So when in the Qur'an the creator states that every single species is similar to man in that they are peoples and nations, peoples that possess language and wisdom, we should not deny that on the basis that we do not understand how they communicate, how they think, or how they obtain knowledge of their own! The very little that we have come to know by far through testing and experimentation, is no argument against what the Qur'an is telling us!

Actually I would say that this single verse in the Qur'an (6|38) contains – alone – much more knowledge about natural life than any biologist could even begin to dream about! All those researchers who have wasted their lives in attempt to prove something as clear as the fact that whales and sharks – for example - do have a distinct language of their own, should find this verse and the likes from the Lord their creator to be terminal to their end; a prize of knowledge by all means! You now know what you've been trying to prove! So start from there, and take the right course!

Prophet Solomon and David his father were given the unique ability to comprehend the language of birds and beasts, and in the Quran Solomon is narrated to listen to the wisdom of something as tiny as an ant, and debate with a hoopoe! So easily would an arrogant atheist make fun of this story, claiming it to be just another legend by the poor people of old! But in fact, he cannot afford a single rational proof for the impossibility of this being true of Solomon or of the nations of ants, birds and other beasts, the way God narrates! There is no reason whatsoever for us to view such stories as irrational or "impossible"! They just choose to think little of it, just as they do with every other story of religion, in all religions! And to them, I'm not at all making any sense when I make such quotations and study such verses!

Even though proper reason and observation tells them that animals do have languages and tribal orders of their own, some of which are quite amazingly complex indeed; they would easily make fun of those stories in the Qur'an, just because it is there in the Qur'an! They would easily appreciate a science fiction novelist when he imagines a time in the future when man has

managed to discover the languages of certain animals and find no problem accepting the idea as *science* (take Dr. Doolittle for example!), but when the Qur'an tells them that the Creator did indeed give this knowledge to some of His prophets, they would readily make fun of it and dismiss it as mythology and fairy tales! What ways could you take to the mind of a man who has blocked his heart and his senses in such a way?

So animals and beasts do have a notion of justice and penalty, and they know about the reasons they are here, and actually the reason why humans are here, far more than someone like professor Dawkins himself knows! None of the pains they suffer in this world is without a code of justice by their creator that they understand and accept! And this is why they will be resurrected in the afterlife to be judged just like we will be judged, except the nature of the punishment and the reward to them will be different, because the nature of their assignment in this life was fundamentally different!

Translation of meanings of the Quran (10|39): ***((Nay, but they denied that, the knowledge whereof they could not compass, and whereof the interpretation (in events) has not yet come unto them. Even so did those before them deny. Then what the consequence for the wrongdoers was!))***

So rebounding to the Dawkins' "silly" comment on the cruelty and wastefulness of natural life; we have all the right in the world to scream in his face: **You just don't know!**

Those prey animals do not find the way they live: cruel or unfair! They know what you don't, they are normally equipped to survive, escape, hide, and die naturally without ever being caught by that predator! And they know since early stages of their lives what exactly they are here to do and how to do it! They know their creator; they have not been given the choice against Him like we have, because they are not here to be tested with a choice of faith! They do not dream of a paradise on Earth or anywhere, they do not dream of becoming gods and becoming immortal, they do not dream of ruling the entire universe! In fact, they know much better indeed than any atheist thinks he knows about this life and what it is all about!

This is why I often make the remark that if one day we were given the ability to understand the language of apes, Darwinians experimenting on apes in their labs would certainly *not* be pleased with what those apes would have to say to them! They would then wish they were indeed apes themselves, for at least they would be comfortable with knowing what life is all about and what exactly men are here to do with all that knowledge and that unique power that separates them from all other species!

This is why it is a recurrent meaning in the Quran that the Kuffar (especially stubborn unbelievers who refuse to accept the truth when they see it) are indeed lower in rank (of knowledge) than cattle and sheep! This is true, because they choose not to submit to the will of their creator and do what they are made in this world to do, while beasts and cattle on the other hand do submit to the assignment of worshipping Him! Beasts know what they should do with their lives and they know that they have no choice but to submit, they know they have no eternity after death, and they know that whenever they do injustice to animals other than the ones they should prey on (or even if they torture their preys unnecessarily as they capture them), they would get paid in full for that! Yes their range of choice is not as vast as ours, and it does not include choosing who or what to worship other than their creator; but they do pay for their choices nonetheless! **So do not feel sorry for the cruel sight of a beast being ravaged by another beast! It is not without a fulfillment of perfect justice that they do understand and accept.**

This mortal life is all there is for them; they simply know everything they have to know! Atheists on the other hand, know not what they were created for, they know not why they were given choice, they know not what will be of them after death, and whatever they know of the tools and resources of this Earth, they do not know what they should be doing with it, and when compared to the vastness of what is there for them after death, which they know almost nothing about; it is clearly no more than a big **zero**! Cattles are thus much wiser and higher in the rank of knowledge!

((Or perhaps you think that most of them hear or understand? They are but like cattle, nay, but they are farther astray!)) (Translation of the

meanings of verse (25/44)) They are lesser than beasts in knowledge! In keeping with the human purpose they are farther astray than beasts (who are not to blame for not doing what humans are supposed to be doing), and in keeping with the general purpose of creation of all living beings, they are lesser all the same because the refuse to submit to their creator the way those beasts do!

This is no waste; it's a vast richness and openhandedness in creation! One that is part of the overall wisdom and purpose of variety in nature! There are lessons for man to learn in every corner of this Earth, there are benefits for him to make, there are rulings to be abided with, all to be known and obtained from no other source but the heavenly manual of life: The revealed knowledge of the true religion of the creator.

On the Anthropic Principle

In this section of "The God Delusion" the author discusses the so called "the anthropic principle" in astrophysics, cosmology and physics. He starts by stating that the perfect conditioning necessary for life in the system is not only a property of biological systems, but also – by necessity – of the physical cradle where natural life emerged: The Universe! He realizes – as every sane human being should – that life is the way it is not just because of genetic factors and biological processes, but because nature at large – too – is no other way but the way that it should be! In short, and simply put, the principle states that for life to exist, it cannot emerge the way we observe it under any different conditions or restraints from the way the Universe, the solar system and the Earth are! It's the acknowledgment that in order for us to live here the way we do, the universe has to be precisely the way that we find it to be. We do acknowledge – whether we like it or not – that we come to this world to find it – by all means – to be a perfectly prepared home for us!

Now before I start quoting and commenting, let me point to the fact that we humans have no choice but to follow this rationale in the way we observe the world around us! We know that we cannot – no matter how hard we try – come up with an alternative "design" for a carbon based intelligent life form

that could live under any different conditions from what we see; and this is exactly what the Anthropic principle demonstrates![37] Our minds are built in such a way that we cannot escape seeing the mastery of this creation for the marvel that it really is! It is thus unthinkable that a scientist would still insist on holding on to atheism and Darwinism even as he raises his gaze from the microscope to the telescope, and sees the very same mastery and perfect accord, perfect balance and completeness exhibited in the way things are high above just as they are down below, at all levels and all scales! Yet they are bound to sabotage people's reasoning all the way to the end! They have no other way!

Here's an interesting quotation from two atheist authors that shows just how desperate those people are in their search for some rational justification to their position of stubborn denial!

> *Suppose that the universe was infinite and completely random in the large. Then our huge, apparently ordered universe could be just one infinitesimal part of a disordered whole. We would be living in a Humean world: we would have no reason to suppose that in the next*

[37] It is to be noted here that some opponents of the Anthropic Principle argue that there is no limit to the possibilities of life forms emerging on different planets, not by necessity carbon-based, and not by necessity in any way like this form of life that we see on Earth. They would argue that every single one of those constants being the way it is, may be viewed as a necessary but insufficient condition for life to be the way that it is. Well first of all, we never said that a silicon-based life form – for example – is not possible! And yes indeed there is no limit to what life forms the creator may choose to create! But this does nothing at all to the premise that this particular universe is perfectly suited – as it is – to this particular structure of natural life of which we are part, in this earth that we call home! Yes every single one of those conditions is necessary and insufficient on its own, but that's exactly what makes the deduction of perfect tuning too obvious to demand arguing for! Those conditions are "irreducible" because every single one of them is necessary, and they have to be composed in exactly the way that they are for life to be the way that it is! To use the Darwinian rationale of probability, tell me my atheist reader; how likely is it that a single bang (a blind explosion with no creator) would yield this perfectly organized system, and by what reason could the process of purposeful creation and the necessary act of tuning be ruled out from such a magnificent event? Dawkins used the Boeing 747 parable to argue that it is far more unlikely for life to emerge from a single act of creation, than from a gradual "evolutionary" process of chance events, so I ask you now, what would be the outcome of applying this very same parable to the singularity that is called the big bang, as it brings together all those necessary conditions for life on this particular planet, the way that it quite obviously did? And how could any atheist continue to stick to arguments from improbability against creation, with this meaning in mind? As for the question of whether or not it would've been better if we were (silicon-based) not (carbon-based) – for example - with all conditions set precisely for this structure of natural life; this judgment obviously demands a detailed knowledge of the exact purpose for which we were created, along with the rest of the universe, and that's certainly a kind of knowledge that cannot be sought in natural science, or in philosophy for that matter! You have to know what an "artifact" was made for before you could judge if it is made in the best possible makeup for its desired function! Do you claim to have this knowledge, my atheist reader?

> *microsecond everything around us would not go into a total chaos rather like a puff of smoke. We of course would do well to suppose that the pseudo-laws, the temporary apparent regularities, would continue to operate. If they do not then no matter – nothing we do matters. But if they do continue to operate it is as well that we plan according to them.*
> *Is not this a chilling thought, that our huge and beautiful universe (as it seems to us) might be a mere speck, a mere infinitesimal random fluctuation into apparent orderliness in what is really an infinite chaos? The image of a monkey typing randomly on a typewriter to produce Shakespeare's Hamlet would pale into insignificance* beside *the awful reality.*[38]

Just look at the very first phrase in this 'mental masturbation' (for lack of a better word)! The authors start by making a preposterous assumption that has no grounds whatsoever, and go on to "chill" their reader by the bleakness of such an idea! I beg of my reader to be true to himself and judge this kind of literature for what it really is: An atheist's wet dream! What plausible reason does any sane human being who respects his own mind have to suppose that beyond this perfectly ordered universe that we observe everywhere, there is an infinite "chaos" rather than a perfectly capable creator who is everything we should expect of the maker of this perfect craft? How can we even begin to debate with such people?

Well they might as well start by saying: *"suppose the universe was just a tiny particle in the belly of a gigantic whale that swims in the ocean of infinity"*! Wouldn't that be a "chilling thought"? That's what we're getting here! Suppose whatever you wish to suppose; it's okay as long as you do not talk of "design" or a "creator"!

This is just what Dawkins attempts to do with this section: Do not be fooled, people of religion, just like we managed to make up an evolutionist "probabilistic" alternative explanation for the perfectness in biological systems, this perfectly conditioned universe where you live is – as well – not without an equally "imaginative" alternative that suits the Darwinian creed!

---

[38] J.J. C. Smart & J.J. Haldane (2003), *Atheism and Theism, Second Edition*, UK: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 21

So typical indeed of a man of blind faith! It is not enough that it already took him a huge leap of faith to let go of creation and ride against the stream of human sense to accept natural selection as it is; he knows he has to have even more faith in Darwin's theory to take its basic concepts to other places where those concepts clearly have nothing to offer! To play the "plausible-alternative" game in every other field of human perception and reason where perfectness of creation is observed! It is **not** plausible, it is not even reasonable to begin with, yet they believe that with further explanation of their fiction and their corrupt reasoning, they are actually doing "science"!

Quote:

> *"What the religious mind then fails to grasp is that two candidate solutions are offered to the problem. God is one. The anthropic principle is the other. They are alternatives." (The delusion p.136)*

Says who? What makes it an alternative? It is you – atheists - who desire to make in into an alternative, when every sense in every reasonable man says otherwise! Even with the corrupt application of statistical reasoning that they use; it is next to impossible that all such conditions, both in natural life, and in the universe at large, would come to be in such a perfect balance and perfect harmony for the emergence of life on Earth, and for it to progress gradually all the way to conclude in the way we see it now! On what grounds could they dare reject creation as improbable? He says *"Life still has to originate in the water, and the origin of life may have been a highly improbable occurrence."* … May have been?

Just take a single cell and spread the map or the sheet of all chemical reactions that take place in it, and let's assume for a while that those reactions could have been added to one another gradually in an accumulative manner by pure chance until eventually we had what could be qualified as a living cell! (Of course let's blind ourselves for now about the question of what life is and what "chemical reaction" could have initiated it into the cell!)! It is known that for every single one of those reactions – not to mention the formation of the reactants themselves in the first place (chemical synthesis) – to take place initially from its original atoms; it

demands a great deal of conditions that differ from one reaction to the other, like containment, heat conditioning, catalyst agency, etc. Now imagine how many different sets of conditions you are asking of this pointless aimless primordial lake to have been setting and resetting every time a random candidate for reaction was passing by, so that all by pure chance everything is all set and the reaction just takes place, and a new part is added!

And they speak of “improbability”!

Chemists may actually dream of a Nobel Prize for succeeding in the total synthesis of some naturally abundant organic compound in the lab! Robert Burns Woodward was notoriously awarded the 1954 Nobel prize in Chemistry for succeeding in designing the reaction that would synthesize “strychnine” in the lab (a complex compound commonly found in the seeds of a certain tree!); Just imagine the genius and precision of those conditions that have to be prepared for that single reaction! And those people speak of the probability of random composition of a **living cell** in a primordial lake?

Quote:

> *“But the spontaneous arising by chance of the first hereditary molecule strikes many as improbable. Maybe it is - very very improbable, and I shall dwell on this, for it is central to this section of the book.” (The delusion p.137)*

Very very improbable, he says! How much so, professor? More or less “improbable” than – for example – there being an intelligent agent (creator) who explicitly prepared the initial chemical conditions and maintained the balance onwards determinately? Can you possibly give us any statistical way of determining the estimate of the improbability so we could perhaps make a comparison?

Quote:

> *“The origin of life is a flourishing, if speculative, subject for research.” (The delusion p.137)*

Correction: The origin of life is a flourishing subject for *fiction* and *myth* in the name of science!

Quote:

> *"Again as with temperature, there are two hypotheses to explain what happened - the design hypothesis and the scientific or 'anthropic' hypothesis." (The delusion p.137)*

Again he makes the biased distinction between science and "design", - argument from atheist faith - and forces unto the reader his subsequent philosophical position that the "Anthropic" conception is **not** in accord with creation, but an "alternative to it" building upon that as though it were a given fact! Now how high do people have to "raise their consciousness" so they could have this clear sign of perfectness and mastery in creation tagged as yet another "alternative of science" for creation the way he insists on rendering it, I have no idea; but it has to be too high indeed! Let's see how he will try to talk us into it.

Listen to this naive image of creation that he presents in a repulsive attempt to make people think less of it! I quote:

> *"The design approach postulates a God who wrought a deliberate miracle, struck the prebiotic soup with divine fire and launched DNA, or something equivalent, on its momentous career." (The delusion p.137)*

How funny indeed! The creator – praised be - has nothing to do with this cartoonish image that you have been soaked into believing throughout your entire adult life, professor! We do not postulate anything, and we have nothing to do with your mythological faith that holds life to have emerged by pure chance in a lake of dead proteins hanging around in abandon!

We, humans, cannot imagine a group of inanimate molecules, turning into **living** cells through some "chemical reaction", no matter how complicated that reaction may really be! Chemistry is the discipline that studies the interaction between different forms of matter in nature! The construction of new bonds from old decomposed bonds between basic building blocks of

matter, and the phenomena that such compositions and decompositions are parts of; this is – in simple words - what chemistry is about! So obviously, a "chemical reaction" has nothing to do with whatever it is that turned this group of building blocks of inanimate matter into **living** cells!

What is life, professor? How do you define life? Life is – as defined in English dictionaries – the sum of all factors that distinguish a living organism (animate matter) from dead matter! Chemistry – again – is the transformation of elements of matter to other elements of matter, regardless of the fact that such transformation may take place as part of the processes of life in a living cell. I say regardless because quite obviously, life is an additional power or governing force that runs (animates) dead matter and runs those organic reactions themselves; a force or a factor that distinguishes the living from the dead! So whatever that force may be, it's not chemical!

Furthermore, we are supposed to believe this reaction to have taken place by pure accident at the bottom of a lake where no medium of any sort was ever prepared for the purpose in advance, and no restrictive or conservative force whatsoever to guarantee for any of the essential initial conditions – whatever they may be – to remain restricted within the medium for the reaction, and for all elements of the reaction to take none but the exact course of motion they should be taking for the sake of this "miracle" of a reaction to take place, and for a simple amino acid to emerge!

One really fails to decide where to begin when he argues against such monumental nonsense! From language? From natural law? From basic reasoning? Well, it's your pick!

It is enough for now to say that if anybody even as much as tries to mimic this alleged "chemical reaction" in a lab, he is clearly fooling himself; because they do not believe it to have had any particular conditions *prepared* for it – unlike anything that we may recognize as a chemical reaction – or anything that might be called a reaction, anywhere in our labs or in nature -, so whatever preparations they make for the reaction in their labs, they are defeating the very purpose of the experiment while they least know it!

In fact Dawkins does not even describe the experiment as chemists "mimicking", he actually describes it as chemists "recreating"! Of course it is the same thing, but just look at the inevitable choice of words here! Can he not hear himself? **Recreating**! So it *was* indeed created, wasn't it?

Every time a Darwinian gives an analogy for how *chance* could be made part of an ongoing system, he forgets that it takes determinate planning and design to define the exact part where "chance" is to be involved in a system that is particularly designed for this purpose! Like we argued earlier, a system that involves "random" processes is a designed system of random generation; the generation of a result that is not particularly chosen by the designer, but is prepared as part of a set of different probable choices to which the generator is restricted by design! It is a designed system of selection in which each item of the designed set has an equal probability of being chosen, and only the right element stays in place. This is why whenever Dawkins makes an example to demonstrate the way random mutation works under natural selection; he forgets that a **random generator is – in itself – a purposeful design**!

A chemist will always do what a designer does in his lab whenever he prepares to mimic the alleged reaction in the so called primordial soup, even if the design is a random generator! He will restrict the elements he uses, define in advance each and every one of these elements, and hence prepare a set of given choices of equal probability, ones that are all restricted to the conditions and the medium that he prepared! This is by no means what is claimed to have taken place in the primordial soup!

Like I said in an earlier section some atheists argue that if you placed a monkey on a keyboard and asked him to type at complete random, there is no way you could end up with a book from Shakespeare, not in a billion years! However, if you had a system that would keep the right character in its place once it is hit there by chance (which he believes to be the work of natural selection in natural life), then in time long enough, the book will eventually be written! What they don't realize – or they probably neglect on purpose – is that they're actually talking about a particularly designed system that has the previous **information** of the desired letters and their

places determined in advance, so that when a random generator sparks letters at random, once the *right* letter hits *its place*, it remains there! This again has nothing to do with the claim that natural selection has no previously designed code, not to mention the story of the primordial soup, because there is supposed – according to the very meaning they give to the word Chance - to be no previous design or code of right and wrong to keep anything anywhere at all!

Again he commits the very same crime against the rationale of statistical improbability when he says:

> *"If the odds of life originating spontaneously on a planet were a billion to one against, nevertheless that stupefyingly improbable event would still happen on a billion planets." (The delusion p.138)*

In fact, if I were him, and I looked good enough, I would not be satisfied even with a one in a billion billion billion probability! The fact still remains that there is **no statistical** way to determine what estimate of chance is more likely, because quite simply, this is not the kind of event that could be submitted to statistical assessment in the first place, as I elaborated in detail in an earlier section! I just wanted to show the professor that he has no power of argument whatsoever in this conclusion that he is so happy to have come up with, even as we apply his own atheistic understanding of statistical improbability!

Though he does make this confession in the very next paragraph where he says:

> *"Any probability statement is made in the context of a certain level of ignorance. If we know nothing about a planet, we may postulate the odds of life's arising on it as, say, one in a billion. But if we now import some new assumptions into our estimate, things change." (The delusion p.138)*

And he still insists on arguing from improbability, nonetheless!

Yet he says:

> *"I do not for a moment believe the origin of life was anywhere near so improbable in practice." (The delusion p.138)*

Well, believe whatever you wish to believe professor! What you believe is insignificant to the argument; it is what you can *prove* that matters!

> *"Even accepting the most pessimistic estimate of the probability that life might spontaneously originate, this statistical argument completely demolishes any suggestion that we should postulate design to fill the gap." (The delusion p.139)*

And whoever said that we – people of heavenly wisdom - accept any estimate or use of probability in this area to begin with? We don't! Statistical arguments on the subject matter are indeed a perfect example of arguments from wrong application of the scientific method itself, as is the case with every Darwinian argument in this book and in every other book!

He insists on approaching the problem of the very first origin of life armed with nothing but "statistical probability" though he does understand that it is not a problem of biology (and certainly not of chemistry, or even statistics as we elaborated earlier)! He then makes one of his boldest and most fallacious statements yet in this book when he says:

> *"Yet even so big a gap as this is easily filled by statistically informed science, while the very same statistical science rules out a divine creator on the 'Ultimate 747' grounds we met earlier." (The delusion p.139)*

How unbelievably arrogant indeed! This statement is but a multitude of outspoken fallacies accumulated over one another! At the very bottom is the false introduction (or should I say: Indoctrination) of "statistical jargon" itself into the argument, coupled with the ridiculous counter-logical image of "mount improbable" above which is laid the plainly corrupt analogy of the Boeing 747, together with the utterly false analogy of the origination of life from dead matter to the process of creating new chemical compositions from old ones! … An argument – in fact – couldn't possibly get any more corrupt!

I do not think, at this point, that anything more needs to be said in comment on such a claim! And like I said earlier, the depth of corruption in the rationale upon which Darwinism and its doctrine of "science" is founded really leaves you wondering where to begin whenever you wish to criticize one of their arguments in terms of reason! I leave it for the reader to see for himself how blind devout followers of Darwin like this man really are!

Quote:

> *"The observed fact is that every species, and every organ that has ever been looked at within every species, is good at what it does. The wings of birds, bees and bats are good at flying. Eyes are good at seeing. Leaves are good at photosynthesizing. We live on a planet where we are surrounded by perhaps ten million species, each one of which independently displays a powerful illusion of apparent design. Each species is well fitted to its particular way of life" (The delusion p.139)*

Unbelievable! What a sorry case of human demise! **"We are surrounded by ten million powerful illusions"**! Well, in fact he has no choice but to view all reality as an illusion! Otherwise how would he possibly pass through to his reader the position that God is a delusion? What on Earth can any sane man do to make this man **see** things around him for what they very obviously are, and quit betraying his very own senses, his mind and his tongue, turning everything upside-down in such a way? A powerful "illusion of apparent design"? How do those people really believe themselves? How do they even sleep at night?

It would be a waste of time now to exert any further comment on such a statement! I hope it speaks for itself; loud and clear!

Quote:

> *"The anthropic principle is impotent to explain the multifarious details of living creatures." (The delusion p.139)*

Absolutely wrong! It is your own personal knowledge that is seriously impotent in this concern! Every set of living creatures is created for a purpose that serves – among other purposes - the exact mission of man on this Earth, so apart from the only true source where this knowledge is to be obtained, (The manual of mortal life so to speak: The Qur'an) you can go on forever blowing soap bubbles in the air, making as many more arguments from incredulity as you wish! It will never take you anywhere near the truth!

See how he keeps reciting it to himself:

> *"We really need Darwin's powerful crane to account for the diversity of life on Earth, and especially the persuasive illusion of design." (The delusion p.140)*

We really need not count the number of times he praises Darwin and natural selection as he proceeds with the book, it is obvious enough! Well, I really would have no problem with that, if he ever managed – **for once** – to put forth between every two successive times that he does it, a single reasonable argument that makes it worthwhile! I mean, I – too – have praised my prophet and the body of knowledge that I claim to have been delivered to him from the creator himself, more than once, and I have no problem doing it over and over again as I proceed; but it is always in proper context and not for the effect of *hypnosis*; I am not using emotional effects and poor repetition of such statements, and I'm not short of profoundly rational argumentation as I go on presenting my case!

A statement as such is obviously the empty attempt of a helpless man to convince himself of the validity of his chosen faith, and of the idea that everybody else who objects to it, is fooled and is incapable of properly understanding Darwinism! So typical indeed! If this is an argument, one really needs not say anything more in response to it than this: *"I find creation (design) to be far more persuasive indeed, and I find Darwinian evolution to be the only real illusion here*"! So we rest our case there and the debate is over! Nothing further needs to be said! His own struggle to have himself convinced that Darwin's ideas could be more *persuasive* than – or at

least as persuasive as - the rational default conception of creation, is really his own personal problem as a Darwinian, not ours!

Quote:

> *"We can deal with the unique origin of life by postulating a very large number of planetary opportunities."*

Now this is how he seeks to get away will probabilistic argumentation in the subject matter! He is trying to make the impossible improbable, and hopefully less "improbable" than what he claims creation to be! By impossible I mean the blatantly irrational position that such an unparalleled perfect process of origination of life on Earth could come about by chance! So easy indeed is the claim that "we can deal" with the unique origin of life by supposing a multitude of other planetary "opportunities"! But on what grounds of reason is it plausible or even explanatory? This is how it works: Let's dream that there are indeed billions of other similar planets, many of which could host an initial event of origins of life, and we will feel much more secure about denying the creator in this one where we live! Easy now, isn't it?

It really amazes me how such a line of (wishful-thinking) argumentation has come to gain considerable weight in atheistic literature, even in the writings of (full-time) academic philosophers, not laymen or amateur philosophers like Dawkins!

In his book (Arguing for atheism: an introduction to the philosophy of religion), author Robin Le Poidevin pushes the idea of 'possible worlds' way too far indeed, as he argues in favor of atheism! He seems to apply this hypothetical concept in his argumentation based on a deeply confused conception of the idea of multiple worlds possibly existing in the same context that we call reality (though he asserts them not to be coexistent in space and time!) on one hand (the so-called modal realism), and the rhetoric presumption of different possible worlds (different possible realities of which only the current world – as it is - is the one that really exists and we legitimately call reality) on the other. The first hypothesis holds that reality is vast enough to include a countless number of other possible worlds

(existing in parallel, one way or another), one of which only happens by pure chance to host our universe as it is! The other hypothesis of possible worlds that he uses repeatedly in his objections against both the cosmological and the ontological argument is the proposition of a totally different reality where things that we only think of as possibilities or necessities in this world, would be "realities" in at least one of those possible worlds! Though they are clearly two fundamentally distinct assumptions, the author keeps shifting from one of them to the other without any plausible justification, until eventually he argues that (modal realism) or the model of (many worlds in parallel), or rather the controversial nature of its proposition, *'diffuses the fundamental questions of existence'*! What questions? And since when was the mere fact that a certain hypothesis has provoked "controversy" or debate among certain philosophers, evidence enough for any degree of plausibility to this hypothesis? Are we arguing from "controversy" now?

Well, whatever the case may be, one universe or a million; the creator is the only conceivable stop to the regress and is by necessity all that the human mind demands for explanation, and all that it needs as an ultimate source for the only reasonable answer to all other (first order questions) any man can think of! Furthermore, applying - at least - the principle of Ockham's razor here, such an "explanation" of many worlds shouldn't even stand a chance! Instead of having to account for the origins of a single world, you now have to explain (according to your conception of an explanation) an endless array of parallel worlds! So how does he even dare claim it to be a "trivial" explanation, or a "disappointingly simple" answer to the question?

Now I cannot claim to disagree with him on particular objections that he raises against Anselm's version of the ontological argument, or even the three versions that he discusses of the cosmological argument for that matter, but again the problem is with the way atheists draw conclusions from such partial objections as though by picking on the way this or that philosopher phrased his arguments for the existence of God, the rational necessity of the first cause would be inverted! This is not how a truth seeker should work his way through the subject matter, if indeed he is in search for the truth!

Again I remind my reader that even the very meaning of truth itself could be questioned by such twisted forms of counter-argumentation! And indeed that's almost what we get in Le Poidevin's book (*Arguing for Atheism*), as he makes yet another appalling use of the "possible worlds" plot in trivializing even the natural urge to seek an "explanation" for the world being the way that it is, and for us being born in it!

Let me quote: [39]

> *By this point we have become quite familiar with talk of possible worlds. I now want to show that such talk allows us to construct a very simple, indeed disappointingly simple, answer to our fundamental question, 'Why does the universe exist?' However, to see how the explanation works, we have to rephrase our question as follows: 'Why is the actual world one which contains a universe?' The 'explanation' now goes as follows. The set of all possible worlds represents the full range of logical possibility. Anything that is logically possible will be true in some possible world or worlds. The existence of a universe is clearly possible, since it is actual. Consequently, some possible worlds contain a universe, even though many do not. Whenever the phrase 'The actual world' is used by us, it denotes the world we happen to be in, just as whenever we use the word 'here' it denotes the place we happen to be in. So the question 'Why is this world one which contains a universe?' just means 'Why is the world in which I am located one which contains a universe?', and that question hardly seems to deserve an answer. For, of course, the world in which I am located is bound to be a world which contains a universe. The very posing of the question presupposes the answer.*

What a cheap trick! How is any man who respects his mind supposed to even go through such kind of arguments and give them any degree of credibility? It is supposed to be readily sufficient that he describes this so-called 'explanation' as trivial, for us to not even bother reading it to begin with! And yet he maintains that it could suffice as an explanation in the place of (God), or at least challenge it, because according to him, if – a

[39] (Robin Le Poidevin (1996), Arguing for Atheism: an introduction to the philosophy of religion, USA: Routledge Publishing, pp. 34-35)

big "if" indeed – we were to view the world in the context of all other *possible* worlds, we would not need to ask the question why this world has a universe while others do not! Now not only is this mode of thinking laughably unjustifiable and meaningless, it kills the very meaning of "explanation" that we are compelled to seek in this context, by giving you virtually nothing at all! It's like saying to someone who asks you: "why are you here?"; "Well, the question of why I'm here is meaningless, because by virtue of logical possibility, I could be in an endless number of places right now! But since of all places I actually happen to be here, then this question hardly seems to deserve an answer!"!

Quite brilliant indeed!

Just look at the analogy he gives for this toy of "possible worlds" he enjoys playing with in this literature!:

> *A simple analogy may help to make this argument intelligible. Imagine that you are sitting in one of a hundred rooms in some office building. Some of these rooms are occupied, some not. Reflecting on this, you ask yourself, 'Why is this room an occupied room?' The answer is not hard to find. Consider the meaning of 'this room'. Which room is referred to by 'this room' obviously depends on the location of the speaker. As we might put it, 'this room' just means 'The room where I am located'. So the question 'Why is this room occupied?' just means 'Why is the room in which I am located an occupied room?' and the absurdity of the question is at once apparent. Any room in which I am located is ipso facto an occupied room, so in that sense the fact that this room is occupied needs no explanation beyond a brief summary of what is meant by the phrase 'this room'. Similarly, the fact that the actual world contains a universe is answered quite trivially, by a summary of what is meant by 'the actual world'."*

Well how about asking: Why do you happen to occupy this room and not another one? Or even better: What on earth are you doing in this building at all? Doesn't this sound more relevant to what the fuss is all about?

Instead of treading around in the meaning of the term "this world" which is obviously irrelevant to the question that asks about the world we know in

particular not some fancy array of other possible worlds (!), a sane man who respects his mind and who is honestly in a quest for the truth, should rather examine the meaning of the word “why” here, and the nature of the explanation it is seeking! Even now one will not fail to argue against this author here that we still need to know why he happens to be in one of the possible worlds where a universe exists (i.e. why he began to exist at all) rather than otherwise!

So what is this really, if not a hopeless attempt to just blast a smoke bomb in the minds of those who find themselves naturally compelled to hold the only reasonable answer to the question of origins and purpose of the universe (which is the only acceptable meaning of “why” in this context as should be clear from the outset)? One could easily write volumes with loads of such senseless objections and manipulative assumptions to fume the clear truth, or to – at least – convince atheists that it is questionable and vulnerable to all kinds of objections there can be; but then he would only be fooling himself, wouldn’t he?

The thing that really gets on your nerves is that right after this joke of an argument, the author admits that this trivial explanation is “suspicious”, because obviously those other rooms do exist, some of which are occupied while others are not, whereas the assumption of other possible worlds is only imaginary! Well then what is the point or the value or even the relevance of raising such a silly and utterly vacuous hypothesis of “possible worlds” at all in the first place? A pathetic attempt by a stubborn atheist to forge all forms of philosophical escapes from the grasp of the clear truth, even if he had to trivialize or ‘diffuse’ the very question itself! That’s all it really is! That’s all you really get out of atheistic literature! Some authors (philosophers) are only more experienced and better trained with this hideous craft than others!

In short, the scheme of “possible worlds” or “parallel worlds” or whatever you wish to call it, boils down to this: Assume that there are other worlds where all other logical possibilities do take place, and you will see that the creator is not logically necessary and is not even an “explanation”! So please tell me my respectable reader, does this even qualify for an argument?

Now, bouncing back to Dawkins' version of the 'possible worlds' arguments (which is basically another form of his argument from improbability), we find that he speaks of "planetary opportunities". It must be clear by now that no matter how many "opportunities" you postulate for the conditions necessary for the origination of life taking place elsewhere in the universe, the basic problem remains the same! This is why we keep saying that probability is out of the question!

As a matter of fact, keeping up with his probabilistic reasoning, I can say with confidence that the exact opposite to his conclusion will be achieved from that, just as we argued earlier in this literature on the rationale of "mount probable" in natural selection! That is, if it is improbable, highly improbable, that only a few of those perfectly organized conditions for the emergence and preservation of life could be harnessed together in one planet in the universe and configured as such all by chance; then how much more improbable do you think it would be that those conditions may be gathered on a few other planets (not to mention a billion planets!) elsewhere in the universe, also by pure chance? Exponentially far more improbable I should say!

Think about it! Suppose it could happen only once in a billion that a single planet becomes as perfectly conditioned for life as planet Earth, then it could happen only once in a billion billion that two planets become as perfectly conditioned for life as planet Earth! So what is it that he thinks the Anthropic principle is doing for his case?

In all cases, one can't help wondering, billion billion what exactly? Universes? Or cases where a universe came to exist from the same "random origin" as ours and ended up with a planet like ours? Billion billion similar solar systems? Planets? What is your sample space for probability here and how do you define it in the first place?

Inverse reason my kind reader is indeed a sickness to the human mind that needs to be cured; not a privilege of "consciousness raising", and most certainly not the way "Science" should work!

It is amazing how he proceeds from there, giving examples of what he believes are gaps in the origins of life that are even far more improbable than the reactions in the alleged prebiotic lake; he makes the example of the origin of the eukaryotic cell, the origin of consciousness, and so forth, saying that this should actually render the process far more improbable! Now at this point, one would expect the man to recoil to commonsense and start refuting the 'Chance' event principle that he believes in!

Far from it! Instead he dives even deeper in his "inverse rationale"!

He says:

> *"One-off events like this might be explained by the anthropic principle, along the following lines. There are billions of planets that have developed life at the level of bacteria, but only a fraction of these life forms ever made it across the gap to something like the eucaryotic cell."*

So instead of solving the problem of improbability, he so merrily floods it out, making it billions of times larger! How he could possibly fail to realize this meaning is really beyond me! He feels that he needs to assume – totally unjustifiably - a really huge number of "Attempts" at originating life in the universe, so he could fool himself – for lack of a better word - into believing that the fact that it only happened on Earth alone in this way in a lucky sequence of random events, among billions of similar cases where things didn't work out; is no big deal! This is the stance of someone who just insists on denying the obvious, and plunging into an infinite world of imaginary nonsense; there really is no point in debating with such a mentality, is there?

Here's your probabilistic argument professor: (Fallacy) x (Fallacy) x (Fallacy) x … = Fallacy that is too false to refute!

Just listen to him as he says:

> *"Maybe a few later gaps in the evolutionary story also need major infusions of luck, with anthropic justification."*

This composition "anthropic justification" – not to mention the archetypal problem of "luck" - is used here in an absolutely opposite connotation to the very meaning the word (anthropic) should convey! That is, for a justification to be "anthropic", it is by definition one that explains things in a way that favors (or appears to favor) man, and shows everything to be exactly the way it is on Earth for the sake of man (anthropos)! The universe can be in no better way for man to live and prosper! Again, be my guest and look it up in any dictionary!

The "Anthropic principle" as first suggested in 1973 by astrophysicist Brandon Carter meant just this: That man is privileged on Earth, and that everything seems to be working in his favor as a species! [40]

Yet again Dawkins battles his way against the stream and again produces a composition that applies language and even scientific jargon in the exact opposite direction to the very meanings that it is supposed to give!

He then concludes with this:

> *"But whatever else we may say, design certainly does not work as an explanation for life, because design is ultimately not cumulative and it therefore raises bigger questions than it answers - it takes us straight back along the Ultimate 747 infinite regress."* *(The delusion p.141)*

Again, he runs and runs and keeps falling back to the very same objection against creation that he thinks makes plausible grounds for his faith: that 'design' raises bigger questions than it answers; namely, the corrupt argument from "infinite regress"! It turns out that all he really has to hold on to, and would keep repeating over and over as a basis for his position in rejecting the creator; is his irrational belief in the infinite regress and the stupid question "but who created God?"!

[40] (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anthropic_principle)

On the so called Cosmological version of the Anthropic principle.

Naturally, the author realizes that his problem does not end there, at the initial "reaction" that supposedly got the engine of life started by pure chance; it goes back to the origin of Earth itself and the rest of the universe, because clearly, the entire universe – not just natural life and ecological conditions on Earth – has to be no other way but the way that it is, for the sake of life to flourish and for man to live the way he does! So he finds he has no choice but to take the corrupt reasoning that we refuted in the previous section, to another level!

The anthropic principle and the facts that we do observe that clearly demonstrate how the Universe is perfectly suited for our favor, should – at least – hint the mind of an honest seeker of the truth towards questioning the rationale upon which "Scientific" theories of cosmic and biological origins are founded, and the fallacy of the way that the origins of both man and Earth are easily taken by those scientists to be analogous to certain events that we see take place within the Universe and on Earth as parts of the already created system as it is! He should at least realize that there is much more to those initial events of origins than anything he has ever seen or could possibly imagine! But for a scientist to take the anthropic principle itself and force it to serve this obviously corrupt reasoning of his, and to come up with the conclusion that it is – the principle itself in its very meaning – falsely interpreted into perfectness and purposefulness of creation; this is by all means an outrage!

It is supposed to be quite enough for any sane man to think properly and make good sense of things, to listen to this statement:

> *"Physicists have calculated that, if the laws and constants of physics had been even slightly different, the universe would have developed in such a way that life would have been impossible." (The delusion p.141)*

And though he admits it, he insists on driving it all in reverse!

Take this quotation for example:

> *"The theist says that God, when setting up the universe, tuned the fundamental constants of the universe so that each one lay in its Goldilocks zone for the production of life. It is as though God had six knobs that he could twiddle, and he carefully tuned each knob to its Goldilocks value. As ever, the theist's answer is deeply unsatisfying, because it leaves the existence of God unexplained. A God capable of calculating the Goldilocks values for the six numbers would have to be at least as improbable as the finely tuned combination of numbers itself, and that's very improbable indeed - which is indeed the premise of the whole discussion we are having."* (The delusion p.143)

Twiddling with knobs? You really think that our prospect of the way the almighty creator established the universe, is in the image of a human twiddling with knobs? What blame should we take if all that those people have ever learnt about the creator had come to them mostly through fairy tales, pagan mythology and TV cartoons?

Then again he falls back to the very same objection which he admits to be "the premise of the whole discussion"! And as though it is enough for a claim to be established as a fact, only through mere repetition, ambitious appraisal, and confident gestures, he makes – again - the conclusion:

> *"It follows that the theist's answer has utterly failed to make any headway towards solving the problem at hand."*

Utterly failed?

Oh yes indeed! Whatever you say professor!

Quote:

> *"Maybe the psychological reason for this amazing blindness has something to do with the fact that many people have not had their consciousness raised, as biologists have, by natural selection and its power to tame improbability."*

Here is a man who speaks to you, my kind reader, from the other side of rationality! A man who has happily had his consciousness "raised" and

believes he knows the psychological explanation for the 'blindness' of all those humans who have not yet had Darwin raise their consciousness! Oh humans how blind you are! Go ahead and seek salvation in Darwin! How could you go to bed every day without seeking the rational refuge of Darwinism that biologists have found? How could you possibly think and reason your way through in your daily affairs without reforming your consciousness with Darwinism? How could you even believe your own senses when you are still so blind as to view the mastery of the making of the universe as proof for creation? I pity you with all my heart!

I feel I need to ask of my reader to have patience and longevity as he proceeds with reading this literature, because I really cannot afford to make it any thinner! The gap between the grounds of true wisdom and meaningful knowledge on one hand, and this "circus" that dominates scientific academia in the west today on the other, is so vast that it really deserves no less than a book of over a thousand pages to explain it in fair detail! My aim here is not just the refutation of Dawkins' arguments, as I have mentioned repeatedly! I may find myself tempted to repeat certain arguments in different wording for the sake of the context and to better explain it, so please do not be bothered by such repetition! You will see that it helps.

I pray to the Lord Allah – praised be His name - that every honest seeker of the truth who reads these words right now – from whatever discipline or doctrine or background he may be - would not put down this book without having his life and his view of the world and of himself seriously shifted back towards wisdom and truth!

Amen.

The professor proceeds to mention the Darwinian explanation that is given by an evolutionary psychologist for the reason why people tend – according to his claim – to "personify" everything around them! He speaks of the reason why we tend to ascribe 'human' attributes to anything that moves before us, and claims that it is because the risk of not doing so is higher – in evolutionary terms – than otherwise! This is obviously a corrupt understanding of the way even animals view moving things around them!

Every member of a mobile living species that has perception of some form, knows how to make a clear distinction between its prey, its predator, its mate, other fellow members of the tribe and living beings from other species! They never mistake a wind driven leaf – for example – for a predator!

Moreover, we humans do have the capacity to recognize purpose and meaning, and we have the capacity to identify a *deed* for what it is, an event that by necessity demands a *willful doer*! This is not some childish tendency or evolutionary leftover; it is a linguistic necessity! We humans identify willful agency in causation just like we naturally identify r*eaction* as an event that demands an *action*, and *effect* as an event that demands a *cause*! It is a property as fundamental and definitive to human reasoning as every other property of the way we think!

So to easily render this human capacity of identifying purpose and identifying every event in nature for what it is (the deed of a willful doer); as the mere remainder of some sort of ancient evolutionary necessity in man is to approach different features of human consciousness and reason in an unjustifiable way that stands on no grounds but plain Darwinian bias! Humans are perfectly justified in thinking this way! They have always seen it to be quite logical and intuitive! Every event we observe is the outcome of a cause. This cause is part of a chain of causes that ends inexorably at the first cause, the willful and purposeful creator and sustainer of it all. Yes at some points on the chain of causes we may observe other willful causes (like humans or beasts), but the fact still remains that all causes lead to the first essential cause, who must have had the will and intent to set it all up, and to put everything in place. Only atheists seek to deny and refute the first cause with all its necessary faculties! It's their choice of faith!

And though some philosophers have chosen to label this natural property of attributing meanings that are common in humans to the creator and to other forms of causal agency in nature as 'anthropomorphism', it is not really a (morphism) at all! It is quite reasonable that we humans would assign properties to inanimate things that share a common meaning with certain human attributes! We do that all the time! So if this is what you call

anthropomorphism then all humans are *anthropomorphists* by nature! Every time we say (for example): “The computer is running the program”, we use a meaning that is commonly attributed to humans to describe something that the computer is doing, yet we know that such linguistic use doesn’t – in the least - imply that the machine is animate or has its own will and human-like consciousness! Whenever we say “the ball has broken the window” we don’t accuse the ball of having its own will in breaking the window and causing the damage! We’re not assigning any additional human meanings to it in any way! The mere fact that the meaning we described it with is shared by humans, does not necessitate or even suggest exceeding the threshold of describing the event – or the property - in the right words!

So when we describe the creator by meanings that are necessitated by reason itself, or meanings that are attributed to Him in His authentic scripture, we are not in any way suggesting anything more than the linguistic threshold of this particular meaning; we do not in any way suggest that other human features or meanings should follow in attribution to Him from doing so! The fact that pagans actually merged the divine with created beings (not only humans), and thus ended worshipping human figures, even beasts and rats, not just picturing the creator as a human being; this doesn’t abate the necessity of attributing all authentic attributes to the creator without exceeding them to other humanlike meanings as though the mere attribution of them should allow for analogy and claiming further similarities!

So again, when I say the ball broke the window, I’m not by necessity implying or suggesting that this inanimate object is in fact animate or conscious or “human”! Unlike atheists, we humans normally know how to make sense of what they observe, and to tell animate from inanimate things! And it is not due to a psychological problem that healthy people see creation beyond this world! It is the way our minds are built!

He quotes J. Anderson Thomson in a letter that he wrote to him saying:

> *“ 'The legacy of that is the default assumption, often fear, of human intention. We have a great deal of difficulty seeing anything other than human causation.'”*

It is actually YOU who have a great deal of difficulty accepting the natural way our human minds operate! Why? Because it offends your faith, that's why! Because as an atheist, you do not believe that people should be thinking the way they do, with regards to the creator, or feeling the way they do towards religion, and if one day you could actually cut off that part in a man – whatever it is - that defines his spiritual intake of life, and his natural acceptance of his creator, you would so happily do it!

Are we really supposed to believe that humans – as a kind - suffer from a psychological trick of some sort that fools them all into believing the world to be the work of a perfect creator?

It has become quite clear that since Darwinians knew that people would naturally reject the corrupt logic of Darwinism as it is, they decided they had no choice but try to have them believe that the problem and the delusion is actually in human nature itself, in their own minds and the way they 'evolved', not in Darwin's claim! So the rationale we're facing here goes pretty much like this: You cannot fully understand or accept theory X, because according to theory X – itself – you are not sufficiently evolved (mentally) to do that! So if you wish to accept X (despite its apparent irrationality and inconsistency), you have to presuppose the validity of X itself!

In his arrogant foolishness the atheist would look down on his opponent and say: *"Oh the poor fellow! You don't comprehend my argument because you're suffering from a problem that is inherent in every human being"!* It's only natural then that they found no better playground to forge such a destructive philosophy than the field of theoretical psychology! Hence the so called; evolutionary psychology! It is a Darwinian's attempt to explain aspects of the human psyche according to Darwinian evolution, so that a Darwinian reply is easily pumped in whenever normal people wonder why – for example – they find it ultimately rational and intuitive that there has to be a masterful omnipotent creator to which they should pay homage and submit, or why they feel great satisfaction in religion and spirituality or why they seek morality and justice, and ask questions of the afterlife, and so forth.

The claim that man at some point in history could not make the distinction between a friendly man and a hostile one, not to mention making the distinction between a shadow and a burglar (according to the example he gives here) is indeed too ridiculous to even mention!

To speak of “fear of human intention” as though it is some intrinsically human property is actually a delusion in its own right! It is a property that can neither be demonstrated in a man – except for a seriously paranoid man indeed – nor in beasts! Yes we do fear the unknown one way or another, but we do not “humanize” those things that we fear by necessity, nor do we fear the intentions of every next man that we know not, by necessity!

Let us first determine what exactly is meant by the term (human causation). If by human causation you mean the ascription of any given event in reality to a doer (a being) that is willful – in meaning – and possesses a multitude of attributes that are shared – in meaning – by humans; then you’re talking about a fact of language and reason that defines the very way we humans perceive reality. The very meaning of the word (Cause) leads the human mind to a (causer) by necessity of language. At some point (end of regress) there has to come a willful causer who does those things in reality for a purpose! This fact is seen clearly every time we humans use the composition: (X caused Y). If X is dead matter, then we still need to know **who** caused X! And thus we find ourselves regressing the question to the point where we come to the inevitable meaning that a supreme creator did all that, all the way down to X and Y, all willfully and purposefully, and is to be praised and glorified because of that. There’s no escaping the meanings of making, selecting, creating, running, keeping, controlling, composing, decomposing, balancing, giving life, taking life … etc, in human perception of the world and the way that we see it work! It’s not just (causation) here that we do when we inquire about the willful source of all that; it’s a statement of the overwhelmingly obvious that needs not be argued for! It follows naturally from the way both human language and reason work! It’s not just ‘intuition’ like Darwinians would easily call it in such an air as to belittle it or make it sound trivial or rationally insufficient for argumentation! It’s the way language itself works!

Yes we do seek those immediate causes for a direct physical explanation that tells us certain information about the way this event was caused, but this doesn't tell us **who** caused it all, which remains to be a question that every reasonable man demands an answer to! And clearly enough, by "who" we are inquiring about a "personal being" that has a will and a purpose because this is the way we are built to think about such meanings that reality triggers in our minds as we perceive it! It thus becomes pathetically senseless when an atheist seeks so hard to convince people that their minds are actually playing tricks on them when they work this way, in search for an uncaused cause (which must be willful and personal by necessity of being uncaused)!

So when we see determinate creation and functional composition running like clockwork in nature, we have no choice – rationally and linguistically, not just intuitively – to ascribe this to a "willful and capable creator composer" – not just a 'causer' - that must have done all that for a purpose, **and that cannot by any means be "human"!** We are speaking of certain attributes of ability, wisdom and knowledge; meanings that by necessity of healthy reason – not just intuition - have to be there in a willful creator, – regardless of the "how"! We do that naturally! However, like we argued earlier, it **does not** follow by necessity from this ascription and assignation of necessary (or other heavenly revealed) meanings, that this creator be a "human figure" or "humanlike"!

So again, if by "human causation" Dawkins means certain attributes that could be shared in meaning by humans as well as other non-human doers; then this is true, and it is the outcome of proper reasoning and semantics performed naturally by every healthy human mind! It is the way our minds work!

Atheists would usually fool themselves into believing that they are justified in this rejection by the widespread pagan nonsense among "theists"! So an atheist would refuse a rationally sound conclusion and even take it for a defective form of reasoning, on the grounds that he sees the overwhelming majority of theists in the world actually worshipping human – and even animal - figures! But does this give him an excuse to make such utterly false and extremist conclusions? Absolutely not! Because he knows that Muslims

do not do that! And if he presumes people to have a tendency to paganism because of this property in man, then he obviously does not understand what he is talking about.

Pagans forged this imagery of their deities not because man is naturally inclined to think this way, and to make up "anthropomorphic" gods! This is not true! Pagan religions were – in their origins – monotheistic, with people well informed about their almighty creator through selected prophets and messengers teaching them about God! However, it happened at a certain point in history that people were fooled into honoring their sages by means of honoring statues of their images! Gradually, certain philosophies emerged in those nations that – coupled with the wastefulness of men and the loss of heavenly knowledge amongst them – raised those statues to more than honoring; to worship!

Extremity in position towards those idols (the individuals they symbolize) then started to accumulate even further! And what started as a baseless claim that the spirits of those dead people heard people's prayers and mediated their appeals to the Lord; ended in the claim that they were actually sons of God or even His own physical manifestations or 'avatars'! And from there, further philosophies broke the boundary between the Lord and His creatures, and beyond the concept of the physical manifestation of "God" in this world (and by physical and material in this respect I mean the created material; the creator they claim turns Himself into or mixes with the material that He created!); there emerged total pantheism (that matter itself is in reality nothing but Him!), panentheism, and similar philosophies, along with all trinities and councils of gods ever known in the history of pagan religions! Myths were easily forged, manipulated, accumulated, rationalized, argued for and against, constantly spreading and branching through time and space!

In addition, certain earthly properties and philosophies of pagan practices and rituals were always specifically appealing to the masses; properties that make it really tempting for people to accept! They sanctified unabridged sexuality, gave to the human body a share of the divine; to female genitalia in particular, and turned group sex into an act of worship, in the house of worship itself! A religion with very little taboo and very little restraint on its

followers, and such extremely seductive conception of sexuality and indulgence in the pleasures of the flesh, is certainly one that appeals more to the masses; to that part of humans that desires to have no limitations or codes of obligatory control to their physical instincts and desires whatsoever! It is the same reason – at the other extreme end - why atheists hold on so tight to their faith despite the sheer fundamental problems that they do realize in it! It tempts them by the idea of liberation, it liberates them from any law, commitment, or ritual that other religions exhibit (or at least they hope it does).

Paganism is indeed appealing and is currently spreading in the west all anew! I mean many people may actually choose to convert to paganism and practice witchcraft just to enjoy ritual nudity, the ceremony of sexual intercourse and ritual orgies with the priestesses and fellow pagans in the temple for free! Of course it is so pleasurable when this is what your religion teaches you, rather than a religion that condemns such practices and makes one feel guilty about them! In paganism, it’s not the search for the truth, the nature of the deities or the answers to big questions that appeals to people by necessity; in many cases it’s **the way of life** that tempts them!

This story of emergence, spread and philosophical growth of paganism across nations of old, is narrated in Muslim authentic scriptures, in the story of the nation of the sons of Noah; the story of the first gradual deviation of an originally monotheistic nation into paganism and polytheism.

Now the reason I brought this up, is not to argue against this claim concerning “human causation” here! It is rather to clarify that paganism, and the fact that pagan theists all worship “humanlike” images, sometimes even “beast” images, is **not in the least** due to that alleged ‘psychological property’ or inclination in man, but rather due to a gradual process of religious and moral degeneration and accumulation of innovations, philosophies and fallacies throughout successive generations.

With the pass of time, less of the prophetic truth is inherited, and more manmade fallacies and philosophies are made up and passed on in its place!

The story of religion is indeed fundamentally distinct from whatever atheists think they know!

Now directly after the previous quotation Dawkins comments: *"We naturally generalized that – (he means" human causation") - to divine intention."*
So I hope it is clear now how vacuous and childish this argument really is!

Quote:

> *"Hard-nosed physicists say that the six knobs were never free to vary in the first place. When we finally reach the long-hoped-for Theory of Everything, we shall see that the six key numbers depend upon each other, or on something else as yet unknown, in ways that we today cannot imagine." (The delusion p.143)*

Just look – my respectable reader – at how blind faith leads the way to forging actual mythology in the name of science, even against the very way our human minds work! What is this statement here really, what does it do? Nothing but an atheist's attempt to give his followers a fool's hope that the time will come in the future when a new Darwin will emerge in physics and make up yet another counter-rational proposition that kicks creation and perfection out of the origins of the cosmos once and for good! "*Hopefully the long sought (theory of everything) in physics will do this job for us, and raise our consciousness even higher! So keep dreaming folks!"*

Now this statement is in fact – and against all that he hoped for - a gift that he gives me, holding that all six knobs were interdependent and were never free to vary! He does not realize that this makes it all the more impossible to claim that some of its laws and values may have been tuned – by chance - prior to others, or that some other universes may have failed where this one succeeded! You are of course free at this point to laugh your guts out at this striking oxymoron (*tuned by chance*)!

Einstein is famously quoted to have said: "Did God have a choice in creating the Universe?" Of course, it is of no concern to me here the true nature of Einstein's faith; though of Jewish origins, he definitely did not die a Jew! However, what comes to my attention in this quotation is the fact that people

as bright as that man, could really be so blind in approaching the metaphysical and the Big questions of life! He died a blind man because he sought the truth from his own mind; his own creation! The truth is **not** a relative or subjective prospect, it is what it is; the truth! It has to be obtained from its right source by virtue of evidence, not *invented*! It is not to be made up by a ‘genius’ mind!

It does not take a genius to obtain those answers, but an honest heart in an unbiased search, to find the truth wherever it may be (no search actually even needs to be done at all as you will realize proceeding with this book, and as I will discuss in Volume two)! And if you have that heart, you will be guided, regardless of your IQ! No consciousness raising, no unanswerable riddles at the core of the faith, no mysteries and no need for science of any kind! Every question that a man needs to know about his creator and the reason He created him, does have a perfectly clear and **easy** answer that goes in perfect accord with commonsense and proper human rationality, for every healthy human mind to easily comprehend and willingly and lovingly adhere to. Just let go of your biases, be truly willing to let go of it all and you’ll see you don’t even have to search at all to find it!

Any honest seeker for the truth should at least start by admitting this fact: If we were indeed made by a perfectly wise creator, then we must expect His message to be as simple as it takes for the simplest human mind to understand it and have the human soul enlightened by it. After all, he is supposed to have created us all for the purpose of living by that particular message! So it should be the easiest, the clearest, the steadiest and the straightest of all ways known to man, always in the middle between every two opposing extremes! It should be the best and most effective and economic “operating system” for the human machine, so to speak!

Einstein came up with the theory of relativity, but he refused to admit a fact as utterly simple as this! He did himself a great injustice by all means! I say that because I know the Lord is just, He is merciful, He would lead every honest seeker to the truth! Had Einstein been a true seeker for the truth in this particular matter (the biggest matter of all), he would have been guided to accept it like all those who did! It was always there before his eyes!

So what limitation of "choice" is Einstein talking about?

When man searches and examines the Universe, and he sees that the more he knows the further he realizes that it couldn't possibly be made in any better way for the sake of man and other living beings on Earth to live in this particular way, how can he possibly dare say that the creator must have had no choice but to make things the way they are? We, the limited humans, are bound to see perfectness in no other model of matter and mortal cosmic system but this very one that we observe! This is how we are made. Does this mean that the almighty creator who made it, couldn't possibly create another universe with totally different systems and orders for a different purpose with totally different forms of life, who would also fail to imagine any better universe? Certainly not! It doesn't by any means restrict Him! It only restricts **US**! It shows us that we have been made with this particular mind, with this rationality, to only come to this particular conclusion every time we approach the problem: It's absolutely seamless and it really couldn't possibly be made in any better way! It's our human modeling of reality that is restricted as such, not the powers of the maker of both reality and the human mind that models it!

What those people forget – or neglect deliberately - is the essential meaning of purpose and function beneath this magnificent process of creation! Once you have that particular purpose in the picture, you realize what is why, and see that things are the way they are because this is the best way for them to be made for the sake of the purpose that He chose for His creation! And this is indeed what perfectness means!

((Did you think that We had created you for naught (no purpose), and that you would not be returned unto Us?)) Translation of the Qur'an verse (23|115)

((We did not create the heaven and the earth and all that is between them in vain (in play))) Translation of verse (21|16)

So, it is not that the creator- praised be His name - had no choice, it is because of His particular choice of the job that this universe should do, and

the purpose that defines our own existence in it; that He made it in this particular way, and no other!

So when we read the atheist author making this comment:

> *"It will turn out that there is only one way for a universe to be. Far from God being needed to twiddle six knobs, there are no knobs to twiddle." (The delusion p.144)*

We realize immediately the magnitude of the "crime" that he is really committing against himself and his readers! Every believer in the creator believes the universe to be made this way for the good of man (which is, despite the author here, the core theme of the anthropic principle!)! So obviously any "twiddling" should spoil the system, and remove it from hosting man the way it does; because it is already made as perfect as it should be! This is why there can be no tolerance for any form of "twiddling" in the first place! So I ask: by what proper reason or scientific integrity does this understanding lead us to denying the creator instead of glorifying Him? **The absolute inverse of the way a healthy mind works!**

This is – by every meaning in the word – a crime! An act of piracy!

At some point they find they need to argue for an infinite number of universes covering all logical possibilities so that probability may help them support their beliefs, and here they find they may need to claim the exact opposite for the sake of their faith; that there are indeed no other possibilities for a universe at all! So which way do you wish to have it guys?

It never fails to amaze me how atheist philosophers would easily accept the idea that our universe may be one of billion other universes (multi-verse), or even that we may have been planted on it as the experimentation of a superior (more evolved) alien species, or something of that sort, and at the same time, dismiss as "fairy tale" the idea of a willful supreme creator that is unparalleled, and un-created! It is even more amazing that they accuse the idea of a single masterful unparalleled creator of provoking the question "but who created God" while they do not suffer answering that very same question in the proposition of the superior alien nation (for example), not to

mention other regressive stories of cosmic origins that exclude creation! Whatever answer they seek for the question of origins apart from creation is not an answer at all, it only pushes the question further back!

So it's quite obvious that they're deliberately resorting to any escape strategy or any fantasy that would leave them free from the consequences of having to believe in an almighty creator in the beyond! They are indeed driven in their selections of faith by nothing other than a persistent rejection of "submission" to the will of that creator! They are willing because of it to go to far extremes striving against basic axioms of human rationality! You can see this clearly in every single statement in this book (The God Delusion)! It reeks with it!

Dawkins then goes on to explain how he finds no problem accepting the "model" of recurrent cycles of the universe crunching and expanding (the serial big crunch model)! He knows as well as we all know that there is no way any such theory could ever be proven or falsified by any means of science that we humans know! Yet, he chooses to grant it the name of science, and have it – or the other "parallel megaverse model" - for faith in what was there before the origination of the universe as we know it only because he hates to admit the creator! He might as well choose any other "theory" (actually: myth) in its stead, for no justification or proof whatsoever; only a personal preference of faith!

Suppose that, for example I chose to believe that the universe is actually no more than a huge software program on some alien computer machine; even better; it is only a composition of particles at the subatomic level of an atom in a grain of sand in one planet hanging around in another amazingly larger universe; how could he possibly prove me wrong, on the grounds of his own selected theory? He cannot! All he would have to say is: "this is very improbable"! According to what exactly was this probability estimated? Nothing at all! Just his own personal faith; his previous choice of theories for faith that is expressed in an unverifiable estimation of statistical probabilities in areas of human knowledge that have nothing to do with statistics whatsoever!

In fact, I think I should not use any more of those rhetoric stories like the "grain of sand" example I just made, lest one of them comes to the liking of some poor atheist theorist here or there, and so he picks it up, creates some theoretical model for it, and the next thing you know, you find it published in some science magazine as yet another "theory" on the 'origins of the universe'!

What the professor is doing here is pretty much like selecting a garment in a clothing store! He chooses whatever he likes! First he picks the suit, then he searches for a matching tie, then a shirt and a nice pair of socks, and finally, the most suitable pair of shoes that goes well with the combination! There you go! You have made yourself a handsome set of 'scientific' beliefs that suits your taste just fine!

In a footnote he says:

> *"Susskind (2006) gives a splendid advocacy of the anthropic principle in the megaverse. He says the idea is hated by most physicists. I can't understand why. I think it is beautiful - perhaps because my consciousness has been raised by Darwin." (Delusion p.145)*

Oh yes indeed it has been raised! High enough that you can now pick the most "beautiful" theoretical "tie" to match your theoretical "tuxedo", make it all look whichever way you like, and call that science!

By that, (that child-in-a-candy-store model of forging faith) he so arrogantly holds the position of denying the creator!

Now look at this statement:

> *"Nobody understands what goes on in singularities such as the big bang, so it is conceivable that the laws and constants are reset to new values, each time."*

Sheer contradiction; even in the same statement! (*Nobody understands*…) vs. (*so it is conceivable that*…)! Since nobody understands, thus it is conceivable!

If indeed nobody understands what goes on in such a singularity, one the likes of which we have never witnessed, then how – on Earth - could we conclude that the laws and constants were *reset* to new values there? This is like saying: Since I do not know or understand what happened last night, then it is conceivable to me that X and Y happened last night!

We should understand that a serious process of change – naturally unlike anything we've ever seen or could possibly imagine – must have taken place there, to create the system that we currently observe as the Universe! But the reason we Muslims know that a *change* must have taken place is because this is what we are told in authentic scripture, not because astrophysicists and cosmologists suggest it! We have clarified repeatedly the fact that no humanly affordable analogy could be made between the process of creating a machine, and any of the processes that take place within the machine itself! So whatever it was that really took place in that unique event, is by necessity incomparable to anything we have ever seen, or can possibly use to establish a proper understanding of it!

Thus we say that all we can afford to do – as humans – to learn anything at all about those origins, is take the news that we were given from the creator Himself as it is – after proving it to be His -, and ask for no more! We should stick to revelation as the only authority of knowledge in this respect, and ask for nothing more than it tells us concerning this singularity!

We – humans - have no right to object to some authentic story of creation or of the events at the Day of Judgment – for example – just because they draw an image we have never seen anything like! Of course it must be a unique un-analogous event! We do admit that it has to be unlike anything we have ever seen or experienced in this world, we even find that to be a rational necessity! Yes the story has to be rationally possible of course, but it is also – by necessity – incomparable to anything we have ever seen in this Universe!

An example to this arrogance of theirs is their objection to the scriptural story that the Lord created Adam from dust and clay, and created Eve from a rib in Adam's body! Amazing? Oh yes indeed! One would certainly love to

see something like that as it happens! However, we do recognize the rational necessity of its being out of reach of human analogy! It is not just another part of the ongoing chain of human birth by reproduction that we see every day; it is the very top of the chain of human existence; so it has to be different; fundamentally so! But can you dare say that the way it is said to have happened in scripture, is rationally impossible? Absolutely not! That's the point! We need to prove that this is indeed the word of God, and then we have no choice but to shut up and listen!

Another famous example to atheistic arrogance is their ridicule and objection to the story of the virgin birth of Jesus son of Mary (peace be upon them)! A creator who has shown us such grandeur and richness in creation, and has shown us species multiplying through a dazzling variety of means of reproduction, some even without any form of sexual reproduction whatsoever, how could it be "impossible" for Him to create a child in a woman's womb without intercourse with a male, when He chooses to do that? It is an utterly arrogant and unjustifiable position to reject this story on the grounds that it is rationally "impossible"! No it's not! Because we are speaking of an omnipotent creator who has already created – with ease – all this unbelievably complex and perfect place that we call the world, with everything in it! So how does anybody dare make such an objection? What monopoly of observation, analogy or imagination does an atheist think he has to apply upon the way the creator created life in dead things, so that when he listens to an authentic narration where God says that He created Adam with his own hand and blew His created spirit into him, or that He created him out of dust, and said (Be) and he was, he'd instantly jump up and say: "This is impossible"? On what grounds of reason could he possibly build such an objection? On the very little in this world that he – the human – can observe and analogize? And whoever said this has anything to do with anything that is taking place anywhere in this world as it is, to begin with?

Another example is their objection to the story of resurrection of mankind on the Day of Judgment! They would say: How possibly could all humans who have turned into total dust, in layers and layers of Earth, ever since the dawn of mankind, how could they all be rebuilt and from pure dust, the way it is

told in scripture of Islam? Well, whoever said that we, humans, should be equipped - by creation - with the means or the powers to imagine and explain **how** the Lord will do that when the time comes? Whoever said that we should be equipped with the means to understand how the Lord created life from dead matter in the first place?

This is the very argument the Lord makes in the Qur'an when He says:

Translation of meanings of verses (36|78-79): ***((And he (the infidel) coined for Us a similitude, and had forgotten the fact of his creation, saying: Who will revive these bones when they have all rotted away? Say (addressing Prophet Muhammad): He will revive them Who built them the first time, He is Knower of every creation))***

Translation of meanings (17|51): ***((…Then they will say to you: Who shall bring us back (to life)? Say: He who created you the first time...))***

They dare analogize the creator to His own creation, and forget that it was He who made them the first time, and it should not be difficult for Him to do it again in whatever way he chooses, in another *singularity* that takes place after the universe as we know it is terminated! So what rational impossibility could they even dare speak of here? When the scripture tells them that on that day, on Judgment day, they will have their mouths shut and their very own limbs made to speak and witness on their deeds, they object saying this is impossible! How do they dare? The answer comes to them in the very same manner:

Translation (41|21): ***((And they say unto their skins (when the Lord makes them to speak): Why testify ye against us? They say: Allah has given us speech; He who gives speech to all things, and who created you all the first time, and unto whom you are returned.))***

As dazzling and strange those events narrated here naturally sound, none of them is rationally "impossible"! Yes we've never seen anything like them, but this doesn't make them impossible! Nothing about them could give any man the kind of argument that would entitle him to claim those texts not to be the words of the creator!

This is why scholars and sages of Islam (‘Ulema) always explain how it is that authentic scripture in Islam is only in perfect accord with rationality and that though scripture may include puzzling things that are beyond our imagining, the likes of which we have never seen, it never includes meanings that are beyond what is rationally possible!

Look at how Dawkins then re-iterates what he thinks is an argument from (anthropic principle) applied to a serial multi-universe model this time rather than a parallel one! He says:

> *“Once again, the anthropic principle does its explanatory duty. Of all the universes in the series, only a minority have their 'dials' tuned to biogenic conditions.”*

And once again we say: This is not the anthropic principle “explaining” anything, this is the very same attempt to ascribe outstanding perfectness in creation to chance (or *chancoid*!!) events applying a false understanding of statistical improbability to a fictional story that is nowhere to be found but in this sick Darwinian imagination!

When he says:

> *“It now looks as though our own universe is destined to expand forever.”(Delusion p. 146)*

I can’t help wondering now: Why doesn’t this observation strike him, in the same way he chose to believe – and against all reason - that all creatures only “look as though” they were created when in fact they are not? Because if it is so, then your consciousness should be raised high enough now that you can easily take the exact opposite to what anything at all “looks” as though it is! And then we have to ask you: What sense could you ever make of any observation that you see anywhere? In reality this preposterous approach to explaining reality proves to be – to use Dawkins’ idioms - a “get out of jail free card” for any theorist to make up any proposition he likes best, and claim it for a plausible “explanation” no matter how anti-rational its very foundations may really be, and regardless of the fact that it will never be proven or falsified empirically; and when asked he simply says:

"Darwin has raised my consciousness! Go get your own consciousness raised and then we may debate!"

It does not surprise me at all that he then goes on to display another theory that appeals to him all the more: (The Lee Smolin's multiverse model), one that is actually orders of magnitude more inane than the theory of evolution by natural selection! It mixes both the parallel and the serial models in one model, adding the theoretical mystery of the "black hole" to the mix, proposing it to be like a womb where the birth of new "universes" takes place in some form of physical and cosmological heredity (!), offering a soup of theory that looks pretty much like Darwinian evolution! No wonder then that Dawkins likes it!

From the very same source of mythical nonsense comes this theory that actually raises Darwinian evolution with all its logical scandals to an extra-cosmic level! I suppose we now have to search for the thing that runs the whole process for the sake of its continuity, the way they believe genes do in natural life! Too bad we have never **seen** a single universe other than our own! And it's only too bad that we couldn't possibly think of a place where we could dig out the buried fossils of a dead universe! But never mind that! Just enjoy the show!

I'm really sorry that this is the kind of debate we are forced to make with people who profess to be people of science, seekers of the truth! So sorry indeed!

He does in fact realize the "extravagance" and sheer "craziness" – for lack of a better decent word really – of such ideological prostitution that he'd rather resort to and take for a faith than admit the creator! He knows that even by his own reasoning of what "an explanation" should be like, this nonsense does indeed raise a great deal of difficulties that cannot be found in the concept of creation! So in attempt to find himself a way out of this position he has got himself into, what does he do? He rebounds – again – to the corrupt and clearly biased use of "improbability" and claims that none of this nonsense that he holds here is any more "improbable" than the creator! And of course he does not miss a chance to remind us that have we been but

a little bit more (consciousness-raised), we wouldn't have had any difficulty accepting these assertions!

> *"The key difference between the genuinely extravagant God hypothesis and the apparently extravagant multiverse hypothesis is one of statistical improbability." (Delusion p. 147)*

Oh Really? 'Genuinely extravagant' and 'apparently extravagant'! Sounds so easy now, doesn't it? Well ***prove it*** then! Prove it by means of statistical improbability! I dare you to do that! I give you and your followers ten billion years from today to come up with a statistical proof for this courageous assertion (according to your own conception and application of statistical improbability)!

So easily could anybody claim that event X is more statistically improbable than event Y, when both are fundamentally out of reach of any human process of science or statistical inference of any form to begin with! So while 'Y' is apparently extravagant when in fact it's not, 'X' on the other hand is 'genuinely' extravagant, so let's take Y for the truth! This is the level of argumentation we are dealing with now!

He then makes a ridiculous sarcastic image of "how" the creator may be keeping all elements of the system from going astray, keeping (electrons) for example from losing perfect accord with what they are all made for:

> *"It is because God constantly keeps a finger on each and every particle, curbing its reckless excesses and whipping it into line with its colleagues to keep them all the same." (Delusion p. 148)*

What an impudent childish complaint indeed! It's like a little kid making all forms of false excuses to escape doing his homework!

Of course this has nothing to do with the way the Lord does what He does! It is not our fault that you have been fed since early childhood, the image of Zeus throwing lightning bolts from above the cloud, or that of the white bearded guy in the renowned Michelangelo painting on the Sistine Chapel ceiling, stretching his arm to reach out for Adam! It is not our fault that this is what you think that all people of religion believe the creator to be like!

The creator is the supreme keeper of the system at the far end of the chain of causes and governing laws, from beyond the universe itself!

We cannot know how He keeps it all the way it is from where He is; we can only see a small part of the chain of causes from its other end; from where we stand! The end that we can observe and comprehend! Every law of nature we have ever discovered is but a small part of the chain, as seen from our end! What is there beyond the universe is not within the domain of our observation or analogy! The more we learn about nature the further we realize that what we still do not know, is much more than what we have discovered! And yes we still have a lot more to learn, but none of that which we know, or will ever come to discover about the way we observe nature to work, has anything to do with the way the Lord almighty keeps it all and runs it all under His dominion of power from the other end! This is all no more than the “top of the iceberg”! Everything we can observe and rationalize in nature is made as such so that we could learn it on our own, and make benefit of it for the sake of the purpose of our being on this Earth; but there will always be a place where no man can go or can even begin to imagine or analogize to anything he has ever seen or known!

We are definitely not speaking of a cartoonish image of some human figure that is sitting against a control panel above some cloud, running the system as such! We are not speaking of a gap somewhere in this created universe, where a created creator is doing what he does! Far from it! Praised be the names of Allah!

So the question of complexity – as in created systems – is not applicable to Him in the first place! He is not ‘simple’ or ‘complex’ because neither of the two meanings should apply to Him! He is not “made of parts”, and He certainly does not submit to the laws of the universe that HE created! When will they ever manage to get the creator - in their notion - **out** of his created universe, and quit picturing Him by analogy to His creatures in such a way?! The claim to “explain” Him is – by necessity of healthy reason – **false**! This is, in reality, the basic rational remedy that Darwinians do need! We are not asking them to counter their intuition, or to reverse their rationality, the way they are asking all of us to do; we are asking them to **come back** to their

senses! To fix what they have corrupted! To simply acknowledge that the omnipotent creator is **not** a creature! He is not to be tested or reasoned the way we study any of His creatures! Period!

Is this meaning so difficult to understand?

The Lord as we know Him is not *"simultaneously keeping a gazillion fingers on wayward Electrons"*! Our faith in the creator does not – by any means – lead us to such nonsense!

Again he whines about the simplicity of the argument of creation, and that nothing is easier than saying "God did it"! Well yes of course nothing is easier! And yes of course "God" did it all! But this – as we have explained in an earlier section – does not leave a noble and wise researcher in natural sciences without a good cause and a wise objective for research! It puts him on the only right track with his process, gives him the right end, and keeps him occupied only with research that really helps people and improves their lives! Natural causes on Earth are to be examined and researched by the tools of natural sciences for the sake of achieving actual verifiable benefit to man, not for the sake of giving him some philosophical nonsense to believe in regarding the origins of life and other bigger questions! This is what science is for! It's about time that scientists learnt the limits of their tools! Whatever it is that is out there beyond the universe, or that is responsible for our origins, cannot be known by doing "science"! But only under the power of their blind faith do they refuse to accept this perfectly rational limitation!

It's like a plumber who insists on fixing a broken wristwatch applying his craft and his tools as a plumber! Those tools just don't work there! This is not the kind of questions the answers to which we should be doing natural sciences to obtain!

So if the professor will not be satisfied with his practice of science unless he uses it to obtain answers that cannot be obtained by means of empirical research; then he'd better find himself another job, because he obviously has a serious problem in understanding the nature and limits of his craft!

Quote:

> *"A God capable of continuously monitoring and controlling the individual status of every particle in the universe cannot be simple"*

Well sure He cannot be "Simple"! We never said He is "simple"! We do not say He is "complex" either! Both meanings are characteristic of a created system of His composition! This is the scale of analogy that we humans apply to created compositions and systems that we observe in the world around us! The creator is **not** a created thing! So the measure of simplicity and complexity does not apply to Him! Period.

In fact, it is no surprise that Dawkins did not understand the argument he is trying to respond to by those words! By "simple answer" we mean an answer that fits easily and perfectly in every healthy human mind! And that's exactly what the true answer to a question like: "who made this world the way it is?" should be! It is simple because knowing it and accepting it does not demand of a man to search for tools to study the creator Himself the way any created thing could be studied! It rather has him convinced – as a rational necessity - that the creator **cannot** be analogized to any of His creatures, and that He – in Himself – is **not** a problem for science to solve!

This is another sample of his "whining" against the creator (that's what it is really, nothing even remotely close to rational argumentation!)!

Quote:

> *"Worse (from the point of view of simplicity), other corners of God's giant consciousness are simultaneously preoccupied with the doings and emotions and prayers of every single human being - and whatever*
>
> *intelligent aliens there might be on other planets in this and 100 billion other galaxies. He even, according to Swinburne, has to decide continuously not to intervene miraculously to save us when we get cancer. That would never do, for, 'If God answered most prayers for a relative to recover from cancer, then cancer would no longer be a problem for humans to solve.' And then what would we find to do with our time?"*

Does this man not understand the meaning of the word “omniscient”? Does he not recognize the rational necessity of the creator being as such: Infinitely capable? And yes, He decides on who should get cancer and who should not, and who gets cured and who does not! The whole thing is up to Him! His choice to have a man cured is not intervention! It is His choice to have all related natural causes in the universe that have to do with the healing of a man “tuned” particularly for this man to be cured! Now let me elaborate this meaning a bit further my kind reader, because it holds within it a graphic demonstration for the rational necessity of the Lord’s control over all existence, its fate and its destiny, in addition to the rational necessity of His oneness, praised be His name!

When we say the creator chose for X to be saved from cancer, we are not speaking of a fairy with a magic wand that came down from heaven and like in the cartoons she just touched the sick man and he was instantly cured! Absolutely not! What happens to a man who is chosen to be cured, is that all universal causes necessary for his healing are made to collaborate in just the right way for him to be cured! However, sometimes people appear to have been cured miraculously, this is of course a relative aspect that comes from human inability to detect or follow the causes that lead – by the decree of God - to healing! We only know just a few causes here at our dim end of the chain! The most immediate ones so to speak! Thus when we give a sick man the cure, we are supplying only part of the causes that should all be orchestrated in perfect harmony for that man to heal! And this orchestration in its totality, from top to bottom, is not up to us! We can only afford to use what we have known – by experience – to work as a cause, but the whole thing is up to the Lord Almighty!

So what the Lord normally does is pass His decree of your healing as swiftly and easily as every other natural event takes place in the Universe under His previous will! Everything is already running by His control and His will alone, at all times! All people’s prayers are heard by Him, simultaneously! He is not like creatures, with limited perception; He is not limited to perceive the sight of one thing at a time, or the hearing of one thing at a time! This is a limit that He imposed on our senses and perception by

creation; it does not apply to Him. His sight and hearing, along with His power, and all other attributes are perfect, and unlike any creature, no deed distracts Him from another deed, no sight distracts Him from another sight, no sound distracts Him from another sound!

So everything that He wills and does is part of the way He runs the entire universe, regardless of how mundane or extraordinary it seems to us (according to our relative level of knowledge and experience of observation). We may see some of the causes (direct or indirect) or we may not! In all cases it all runs after nothing but His will!

Even an action as simple as holding this book in your hands to read it, demands the orchestration of an endless number of causes, only very few of which you know of and can afford – normally – to control! You have to set proper lighting in the room, stretch your hands out and hold the book so your eyes could start reading. But as simple as this action is and as limited as its causes appear to be, we may argue that among its causes, are all factors that contribute to its taking place the way that we desire, like, for example, security from an event that would prevent the action of reading from taking place! For example, whatever functions take place in your body so you could stretch your hands out and hold the book may simply be seized when you least expect! And while you know how to move your arms, and they would normally obey your command, you do not have any control upon the multitude of systems that would normally work in your body involuntarily every time you issue such a simple command from your brain to your arm!

Now it is important to understand that the motion of more than one particle in nature would normally be cause for a lot of things (ends and purposes) that the creator wills to happen simultaneously! A man may be saved from the very same car accident that kills his friend! The same car accident may be cause (among the causes) for the loss of a man’s money in repair! It may also be cause for the promotion of a heroic police officer and the tragedy of a fireman, not to mention the destruction of a store’s façade! It may also be cause for two men to meet in the hospital and make an agreement that changes the path of both their lives! So we say that this set of particles (constituting the event of the accident) was made by the Lord as part of

countless sets of causes that intersect in it, for a variety of effects that are all willed and perfectly determined by the creator, to go in no other way but the way they did! This is not limited by a single event in nature, it actually necessitates that every element in every system in nature be directly or indirectly affected by other elements of other systems through intersection of causes and effects all across the universe! He – and only He - willed for all that, and He caused for it all, simultaneously!

This concept of distinct indirect causes was approached by chaos theory mathematicians as they spoke of what they termed “the butterfly effect” or “sensitive dependence on initial conditions”. It’s a novel attempt to model what is in fact no more than the tip of the tail of a huge elephant! The term comes from the idea that one small butterfly flapping its wings in the air, could eventually have a far-reaching ripple effect on subsequent historic events, like for example causing a chain of events that ends up in a hurricane somewhere else in the world! The idea is indeed difficult to grasp or imagine, but it is true nonetheless! There is an essentially delicate balance in the universe between all forms of events that take place in it, so that everything goes under total control, and in no other way than the exact way it is supposed to go! The creator of the universe does – by necessity of reason – have the dominion on all that; on every single thing in it! There can be no room for chance or unexpected results there; no event could take place without a fully known and previously determined purpose by the creator, or else He loses His rationally necessary dominion! As we have seen, every particle is made to move on a particular trajectory in space-time for a huge set of purposes, all are effects that its simple motion is supposed to be part of the set of causes for! Perfect determination on all levels is absolutely essential for life to proceed the way the Lord Has chosen for every single thing in it, because obviously they all affect one another!

Every event that takes place anywhere in the world, changes the structure of countless systems, causing future impacts that no human can possibly expect or predict! And this is exactly the very core of the idea of the butterfly effect.

But we are not talking about a human creator; **never** forget this meaning!

You are not living in a vacuum! You are in constant interaction with everything around you! There are systems decaying inside of you, right now as you read those very words; leaving output from your body to nature, and the other way round! There is energy moving in and out of you at all times! There are waves, fields, charges and fluids in constant motion! The moment you move your hand to – for example – open a door, a displacement of air takes place around it that may be cause to some effect that you in the least expected! As for the creator, He **should** know it in advance; not only so, He should actually have it as a predetermined cause for every effect that it yields in the future, from now and on to the end of this world; just as He made the simple motion of your hand a cause for the opening of that door! Of all that, you know nothing but the very simple fact that you are opening the door! Something you easily do every day!

So little do we know indeed!

((They will ask you concerning the Spirit. Say: The Spirit is by command of my Lord, and only little knowledge have you (all) been given.)) Translation of the meanings of the Qur'an verse (17|85)

Now with further insight, we should come to the conclusion that there can be only **one** almighty, omnipotent, willful creator who runs the entire universe according to His will, and His will alone, in any given instant of time. It is rationally impossible that there be more than one! This is because the nature of the universe and the way it runs, necessitates that the will of the creator for a certain system or portion of the Universe, does not contradict, or stand in the way of His will for another system! His will for a certain child to be born, does not come in the way of His will for a certain man – for example – not to have children! His will for a man to die in an accident, should not come in the way of His will for another man to come out of it alive! By coming in its way I mean that all particles in the universe should work in the way that only leads to both events taking place the way He wills simultaneously! Of course I only chose to speak of two events for the sake of simplifying the picture! So, if there were another authority with a separate will sharing dominion and control over the Universe with Him, The system will certainly fail, or it will have to split, for there will be a conflict of will

that cannot be tolerated in such an unbelievably sensitive system! And that's exactly what the Qur'an tells us.

Translation of the meanings of the Qur'an (21|22): ***((Had there been other gods beside Allah, then verily both (the heavens and the earth) would have been disordered...))***

Translation of the Qur'an (23|91): ***((Allah has not chosen any son, nor is there any god along with Him; for then each god would have assuredly championed that which he created, and some of them would assuredly have overcome others. Glorified be Allah above all that they allege.))***

You pray for your god to bring you victory on your enemy, and the enemy prays to his god to make him the victorious one! What shall be of that? You pray to your god to heal you, and he wills to answer your prayer, but that would cause something to happen against the will of another god! What would be then? Those are only examples to bring the image closer to your mind, for in reality, as we have stated earlier, every single event that takes place anywhere in the universe, has to be in perfect accord with the will and purpose that is intended for every other event, because it does have an impact on it, one way or another!

So I ask my kind reader to reread the last quotation by Dawkins about "God" and the way he thinks he "intervenes" with nature, one more time, and judge for himself the level of ignorance we are forced to deal with in response to this literature of his!

You may laugh as you wish then when you read professor Dawkins exclaiming that certain author X *"mistakes what it means to explain something, and he also seems not to understand what it means to say of something that it is simple"!*

So unbelievably arrogant and ideologically flat is his discussion of the being of the creator! What could you possibly know about that? And where could you possibly obtain such knowledge? Reason has it that His essence be unlike anything at all!

((…Naught is as His likeness; and He is the Hearer, the Seer.)) Translation of verse (42|11)

It is indivisible, yes, but not because it is an exceedingly complex system, but because quite simply, it is not a created system that we can analogize to any system that we see! It is not something that we even have the right to call a system to begin with! His being is not a "composition" of parts! Yes He does have a face, a hand, and even fingers, as it is narrated in Islamic texts, and as we explained in an earlier section, but these are **not** "parts", in the sense that our organs are! We do understand the meaning and the deeds that those attributes do, but we have no right to analogize them to any created equivalents of any sort! Yes Adam was created after the image of the Lord, but this is only in the meaning, in the fact that he shares the meaning of many such attributes of the Lord! And while they are composed parts in Adam, they are nothing like that in God! The Lord has eyes and He can see, and so does Adam, the Lord can hear, and so does Adam, the Lord has a face and so does Adam! It is especially glorified as an attribute to the Lord, and so is the face to a man! This is what is meant by the image in heavenly scripture! And had Christians not wasted the actual words of God, they would have found solid verses like the one I just quoted from the Qur'an, directing their understanding to the truth regarding the being of the Lord and the truth regarding His attributes!

None of these meanings that Allah attributes to Himself necessitates that the He be in any way analogous to His creation, or be in the form or "physical likeness" of a creature! We do not know and cannot possibly know or imagine how He knows all that He knows and does all that He does the way He does, simultaneously, but that certainly does not contradict or inhibit the rational necessity of His being the only being capable of doing it, and the necessity of His being un-analogous to anything that He created!

So, people of science, dare not speak of your creator like you speak of a lab rat! Praised be His almighty being! Desist before it is too late, when no regrets could do you any good!

The professor then concludes with the story of a certain Cambridge public event of which he was part, and describes how frustrated he was that the audience was religious, and implied that they were all stubborn, insisting on "arguments from incredulity"! He goes on describing futile details repeating the very same arguments from improbability that he has centered his entire case upon! He makes it clear that he is ready to believe in any "god' just as long as it – in itself – could be explained by perhaps some Darwinian story! He complains of opponents calling his position a "nineteenth century" position, and claims that such a comment should not come from people who are embarrassed to mention that they still believe in miracles like "virgin birth"! He blatantly calls it absurd and irrational! And since we have fairly demolished this position on the course of the previous part, perhaps even more than once and with more than a single argument, we find it wasteful to readdress it again here!

So, to sum up, I found it would be best to skip commenting in detail on that part, and even the conclusion by which he concludes this chapter!

Instead, I will make my own conclusion to this part, from whence we conclude this volume as a whole.

Conclusion

1 – I find it unbelievable that any sane man should really have to respond to such a statement: “The natural temptation is to attribute the appearance of design to actual design itself”! It’s just like complaining from man’s “natural temptation to attribute the appearance of daylight, to daylight itself”! We have – I hope – written enough in the radical demolition of such anti-rational nonsense. Nothing more needs to be said!

2 – The author keeps revolving over and over again around the very same unreasonable and age-old complaint: “But who created the creator?”, and I believe I have responded to that false question eloquently.

3 – The argument from improbability (or what he calls ‘the Ultimate 747’) is a clear demonstration of how the doctrine of Darwinism is founded on inverse rationality, and on a **false** application of different tools of mathematics and statistics!

4 – I have explicitly demonstrated the magnitude of irrationality and inverse reasoning even at linguistic level that the Doctrine of Darwinism fosters and builds upon!

5 – The sheer corruption in his use of the Anthropic principle in proposing (multiverse) models, thinking that in doing so, the *improbability* of the singularities at origin of the universe not to mention natural life, would drop! (A clear example of what Darwinian philosophy does to a scientist!)

6 – He ventures into cosmology and physics, even chemistry, trying so desperately to make up some “gap filling” “explanation” that could appeal to the reader to accept in place of the rational imperative of creation! He fails to realize that instead of explaining what has to be a starting point (a singularity) he actually regresses it into another part of another evolutionary chain of some sort; which shows that the best way he can think of to explain “origins” is actually to kick it up in regress!

7 - The conclusion he makes is: there was never any first origin; there was always a universe, or a series of universes, recurring infinitely in the past as

into the future! So typical of an atheist indeed! Actually so typical of any materialist philosopher! He simply cannot allow himself to accept the idea of a first transcendent origin to the whole thing; so he has to keep the regress of material causes going back to eternity despite everything that he sees that tells him otherwise! There has always been matter, and matter is all that is there in existence! *Make up whatever story you wish to "explain" it, but only make sure that it doesn't have a point where there has to come an external un-analogous source beyond it all!*

Of course there's more than these seven points that the reader will conclude as her reads through, and I suppose he may find himself eager to know more, and will have many questions triggered in his mind; so I ask him to wait until he's done reading both volumes, for there's much more that I still have to say in volume two. It's not only a detailed response to the rest of Dawkins' book, as my reader shall see.

In conclusion of this volume, I leave it up to you now, my reader, to judge the kind of literature that atheistic argumentation makes, and to take even deeper insights into the fundamental fallacy of Darwinian philosophy, and I pray that you can see things the way all healthy people do, not the way the Darwinian doctrine does to people! Amen.

Epilogue

"They're there because they're there because they're there because they're there! ..."

This was the remarkable comment that Dawkins made in one of his 1991 Christmas lectures (lecture 4 of the series: Growing up in the universe) when he was refuting a little girl's answer to the question: "What do you think flowers are for?"! This is the kind of consciousness raising that he was teaching to those poor kids in the audience that day, as opposed of course to acknowledging that "The creator made things the way they are for a justifiable purpose, one that we should seek to learn from Him"! No, he argues, nature is not the way it is for our purpose as humans; because it also works good for the needs of every other being on Earth (hence the title of the lecture: The ultra-violet garden!) So the conclusion is: all living creatures are just viruses the programming code of which "Just happened" to give none but the command: "Copy me", and that's all that life is about!

This is how he teaches them to approach the Big questions of the world around them! This is what children are taught in elementary schools under the tag of science and biology! *"It's there because it's there!"* If this is not direct atheistic indoctrination, and assault on all human knowledge, then I don't know what is!

Based on this intellectual "vomit" of argumentation that we have seen in chapters 3 and 4 of (The God Delusion), Dawkins believes he has come to the conclusion that there is "almost certainly" no God! After all this long struggle of his against basic reasoning and A-priori rationality, all that he has to offer us is the conclusion that "God" is very "unlikely" to exist!

He really expects people to let go of their commonsense and their very grasp on reality itself for the sake of such a radically corrupt application of "statistical probability"! He really thinks that people would spoil their minds, twist their own tongues, and go against the clearest and the most obvious conclusion of all humanly affordable conclusions, all on the grounds of comparative "improbability"! And for the sake of what? The comic book

image of a "mount improbable" that is – according to his own use of probability - orders of magnitude more improbable than the single act of perfect creation! And the idea of "universe reproduction" and natural selection among "universes" as explanation for the way our universe is so perfectly tuned in favor of man! The idea that those unbelievably perfect "singularities" that gave rise to both the origination of this Earth, and the life on it, as improbable as he says they are, all took place by pure chance, and might have all – to certain degrees - taken place on billions of other planets, but only this one was "lucky" enough to have everything as perfectly adjusted for our human life as it is!

All that, and he denies the creator on the basis of "improbability", and the arrogant position that unless he could put the being of the creator Himself to a simulation or into a test tube, he should not accept His existence!

What could you possibly do to such a mentality?

If he believes that belief in the existence of an almighty creator is to humans at the rank of a "theory of science" or comes from a "hypothesis" that a man once came up with and had people believe it, in the sense that they chose to adopt it only after the postulation of a theory, and a vast process of gathering of "evidence", and production of likely explanations that serve the theory - a position that is built and rebuilt entirely on arguments from statistical improbability –, then it is he who is in deep delusion, and he certainly does not accept the way human reason works! This is **not** how humans come to the natural conviction of the existence of a supreme creator! They do not "come *to it*" actually, they come *with it*; they are born to find it there at the bottom of their souls!

Yet he asks them to close their eyes, neglect the very obvious light of the sun, and start gathering things that may make them "feel" – in their deliberate blindfold – as though there is no daylight at all, and that it is only an illusion that this is how things appear to be! He seeks to have them believe that it is very "improbable" that this light they see shining down on the face of the Earth, is indeed the light of the sun, coming down from that huge "lamp" of fire up there in the middle of the sky! He works to convince

them that they may indeed need to have their "consciousness raised" for them, so they could make such a leap against the stream of their own human perception and reason!

This is what he's really offering you, my reader! In order to get you out of your naturally justified belief in the creator, and to convince you that His existence is "statistically improbable", he knows he has to get you out of your commonsense, and invert your entire rationale as a human being! And that's exactly what this part of his book was about!

So in short I say:

1 – The existence of the creator was never a theoretical assumption; it is natural axiomatic reason, natural language and intuition, and any attempt to deny it is as false – linguistically - as suggesting that Disorder = order (design = non-design), and as false – mathematically – as this expression: 0 = 1, or in Darwinian terms: (given enough time, 0+0+0+0+ … +0 = 1)

2 - There's absolutely no empirical observation that could ever tell us any factual information about the historical origins of natural life or the universe! Uniformitarianism is a philosophical position that we are only inclined to accept when no reliable evidence of otherwise could be established! It definitely has nothing to do with those singularity events at the origins of the system! It will always remain to be a hypothesis to help produce theory on progression of events in nature! It should never be taken for argument against any form of evidence that suggests singularities on the path of natural, geologic, or cosmic history, especially when the evidence for such exceptional events is authentic scripture!

3 - As for "forensic" theorization, we have already explained in detail how irrational and pointless it is to place the compilation of forensic evidence "explanatory theories" in support of a fundamentally flawed theory that comes in opposition to what is supposed to be "A-priori" rationale and even linguistic necessity!

Forensic science applies probabilistic theorization based on models and patterns of previously observed and studied cases of human behavior (or any other observable recurrent phenomena for that matter) within rules of this system we observe, and this clearly does not apply to the singular story of emergence of natural life on this Earth (or the rest of the system itself).

4 – Chaos and random are only in the eye of the limited human beholder; whereas the system is obviously too perfect for us to even grasp; no purposeless or "chance events" could – at any level of rational or linguistic integrity - be introduced at any point to the history of natural life, at its origin or afterwards!

5 – Statistical improbability does not apply to primordial events or the question of origins, and even if we were to apply it – following the false atheistic conception of improbability – we would easily blow the Darwinian myth out of the water! This is because not only does it defy basic reason and rational necessity; it actually backfires in the atheist face on applying this very understanding of probability itself!

Natural science has no impact whatsoever, positive or negative, on the question of whether or not the creator exists.

In the next part – to be discussed in volume 2 - Dawkins moves on to "entertain" us with his view on how religion "originated", (by natural selection of course!) and starts his blind campaign against what he views to be the corruption caused by religion, on the hope that by destroying Christianity and perhaps a couple more religions as well, he could have his reader convinced once and for all, that there is no creator to submit to, and that He has sent nothing at all to mankind!

Written by;
Abulfeda' Ibn Mass'oud

Abulfeda1431@yahoo.com

Finished on the
Nineteenth of Ramadan 1430 (After Hijrah),
September 9, 2009

Contents